

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brandegge	Harrison	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Calder	Heflin	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Penrose	Smoot
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Pointexter	Stanley
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Pomerene	Trammell
Dillingham	Keyes	Ransdell	Underwood
Elkins	King	Robinson	Wadsworth
Gerry	Knox	Sheppard	Warren
Gooding	McCumber	Shields	Willis
Hale	McKellar	Simmons	

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the absence of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The reading clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. GRONNA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. SPENCER, Mr. STERLING, and Mr. SUTHERLAND answered to their names when called.

Mr. FERNALD entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-six Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. PENROSE. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms is directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. LODGE, Mr. COLT, and Mr. TOWNSEND entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania withhold his motion to enable me to submit a report from the Committee on Commerce?

Mr. PENROSE. I yield for that purpose.

#### COPPER HARBOR RANGE LIGHTHOUSE RESERVATION, MICH.

Mr. JONES of Washington. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 14122) to authorize the sale of a portion of the Copper Harbor Range Lighthouse Reservation, Mich., to Houghton and Keweenaw Counties, Mich. I call the attention of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] to the bill.

Mr. TOWNSEND. This is a bill to which there is no objection. It provides for the sale of a portion of the reservation to the counties named. The Government approves the sale. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside for the purpose of considering the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it will be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. KING. Let the bill be read.

Mr. HARRISON. Can not the Senator call up the bill in the morning?

Mr. TOWNSEND. If there is any objection I shall not insist on its consideration now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not understand the Senator from Michigan. Is it his desire to have the bill passed?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do desire to have the bill passed. It is a bill which passed the House some time ago and it is now favorably reported. There is no objection to it anywhere. It simply provides for the sale of a portion of the lighthouse reservation in the upper region of Michigan.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It has been favorably reported by the Senate committee?

Mr. TOWNSEND. It was unanimously reported from the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### RECESS.

Mr. PENROSE. I renew my motion that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, January 28, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, January 27, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The SPEAKER. Dr. Couden has requested that until his resignation takes effect Dr. Montgomery may substitute for him.

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., of the Calvary Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, we beseech Thee to hear us. On the breath of our prayer is the confession of our sins. Deepen our sympathies toward all men who fail. Broaden our understanding of all the needs and problems of our country and heighten our aspirations beyond all those virtues that make men chivalrous, brave, and true. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold that until the Journal is approved?

Mr. LANGLEY. I will.

The Journal was approved.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the Agricultural appropriation bill. When the House adjourned last night the question pending was, Will the House reconsider the vote by which the seed amendment was rejected? The vote will come on that question first.

The question was being taken, when Mr. LANGLEY made the point that no quorum was present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and as many as are in favor of the motion to reconsider will, as their names are called, vote "aye" and those opposed will vote "no," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 166, nays 153, answered "present" 2, not voting 108, as follows:

#### YEAS—166.

Almon	Fisher	McDuffie	Sisson
Aswell	Flood	McKeown	Slemp
Bacharach	Fordney	McKinley	Small
Bankhead	Ganly	Martin	Smith, Idaho
Barkley	Gard	Mason	Smithwick
Bee	Garner	Mays	Stegall
Bell	Garrett	Miller	Stedman
Benham	Goodall	Minahan, N. J.	Steenerson
Blackmon	Goodykoontz	Moore, Ind.	Stephens, Ohio
Bland, Ind.	Greene, Mass.	Morin	Stevenson
Boies	Griffin	Murphy	Stinness
Bowers	Hadley	Nelson, Mo.	Stoll
Bowling	Hardy, Colo.	Newton, Minn.	Strong, Kans.
Brand	Hardy, Tex.	Newton, Mo.	Summers, Wash.
Briggs	Hastings	Nicholls	Sweet
Brinson	Hays	O'Connor	Taylor, Ark.
Brooks, Ill.	Hickey	Oldfield	Taylor, Colo.
Brooks, Pa.	Houghton	Oliver	Taylor, Tenn.
Brumbaugh	Howard	Osborne	Thomas
Byrns, Tenn.	Huddleston	Padgett	Thompson
Campbell, Pa.	Hudspeth	Park	Tillman
Candler	Humphreys	Parker	Timberlake
Caraway	Jacoway	Phelan	Tincher
Carrs	Jeffers	Pou	Valle
Carter	Johnson, Miss.	Quin	Venable
Clark, Fla.	Juul	Raker	Vestal
Classon	Keller	Ramsey	Vinson
Collier	Kendall	Randall, Calif.	Voigt
Crisp	Kiess	Ransley	Watkins
Davey	King	Rayburn	Weaver
Davis, Minn.	Kreider	Rhodes	Welty
Davis, Tenn.	Lampert	Ricketts	White, Kans.
Dent	Langley	Riddick	Wilson, La.
Dickinson, Mo.	Lanham	Robison, Ky.	Wilson, Pa.
Dominick	Lankford	Rodenberg	Wingo
Doughton	Larsen	Rouse	Woods, Va.
Drane	Layton	Rubey	Wright
Dupré	Lazaro	Sanders, La.	Yates
Dyer	Lea, Calif.	Sanders, N. Y.	Young, Tex.
Eagle	Lee, Ga.	Sears	Zihlman
Echols	Lehlbach	Sells	
Fields	Longworth	Sims	

#### NAYS—153.

Ackerman	Burdick	Crowther	Ellsworth
Anderson	Burroughs	Currie, Mich.	Elston
Andrews, Md.	Byrnes, S. C.	Curry, Calif.	Esch
Andrews, Nebr.	Campbell, Kans.	Dale	Evans, Mont.
Anthony	Cannon	Darrow	Evans, Nebr.
Ashbrook	Chindblom	Dempsey	Fairfield
Barbour	Christopherson	Denison	Fess
Benson	Clark, Mo.	Dickinson, Iowa	Fish
Black	Coady	Dowell	Foster
Bland, Va.	Cole	Dunbar	Frear
Blanton	Conrally	Dunn	Freeman
Box	Cooper	Eagan	French
Browne	Crago	Edmonds	Fuller
Buchanan	Cramton	Elliot	Glynn

Godwin, N. C.	Klecza	Moore, Ohio	Steele
Good	Knufson	Neely	Strong, Pa.
Gould	Kraus	Ogden	Summers, Tex.
Graham, Ill.	Linthicum	Olney	Swindall
Green, Iowa	Luce	Paige	Temple
Greene, Vt.	Lufkin	Parrish	Tilson
Hamilton	Luhling	Patterson	Towner
Hawley	McAndrews	Pell	Treadway
Hayden	McArthur	Perlman	Volstead
Hernandez	McClintic	Peters	Walsh
Hersey	McFadden	Porter	Walters
Hicks	McKenzie	Purnell	Wason
Hoch	McLaughlin, Mich.	Radcliffe	Watson
Husted	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Ramseyer	Webster
Hutchinson	McPherson	Randall, Wis.	Welling
Ireland	Madden	Reavis	Wheeler
Johnson, S. Dak.	Magge	Reber	White, Me.
Johnson, Wash.	Mann, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.	Williams
Jones, Pa.	Mansfield	Rogers	Willson, Ill.
Jones, Tex.	Mapes	Rose	Winslow
Kahn	Merritt	Scott	Woodyard
Kearns	Michener	Shreve	Young, N. Dak.
Kelley, Mich.	Monahan, Wis.	Sinclair	
Kelly, Pa.	Mondell	Sinnott	
Kinkaid	Montague	Snyder	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Dallinger Sherwood

## NOT VOTING—108.

Ayres	Gandy	Little	Robinson, N. C.
Babka	Goldfogle	Loefer	Romjue
Bacr	Goodwin, Ark.	McCulloch	Rowan
Begg	Graham, Pa.	McGlennan	Rowe
Bland, Mo.	Griest	McKiniry	Rucker
Britten	Hamill	McLane	Sabath
Burke	Harrell	McLeod	Sanders, Ind.
Butler	Harrison	MacGregor	Sanford
Caldwell	Haugen	Maier	Schall
Cantrill	Hersman	Major	Scully
Casey	Hill	Mann, S. C.	Siegel
Casey	Hoey	Mead	Smith, Ill.
Cleary	Holland	Milligan	Smith, Mich.
Copley	Hullings	Moon	Smith, N. Y.
Costello	Hull, Iowa	Mooney	Snell
Cullen	Hull, Tenn.	Moore, Va.	Stephens, Miss.
Dewart	Igoe	Mott	Sullivan
Donovan	James, Mich.	Mudd	Swope
Dooling	James, Va.	Nelson, Wis.	Tague
Doremus	Johnson, Ky.	Nolan	Tinkham
Drewry	Johnson, N. Y.	O'Connell	Upshaw
Emerson	Kennedy, Iowa	Overstreet	Vare
Evans, Nev.	Kennedy, R. I.	Rainey, Ala.	Volk
Ferris	Kettner	Rainey, Henry T.	Ward
Focht	Kincheloe	Rainey, John W.	Whaley
Gallagher	Kitchin	Reed, W. Va.	Wise
Gallivan	Leshner	Riordan	Wood, Ind.

So the House voted to reconsider.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. GRIEST (for) with Mr. BUTLER (against).

(against). Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina (for) with Mr. DALLINGER

Mr. RUCKER (for) with Mr. MCLEOD (against).

Mr. JAMES of Virginia (for) with Mr. HOLLAND (against).

Mr. KINCHELOE (for) with Mr. SHERWOOD (against).

General pairs:

Mr. TINKHAM with Mr. TAGUE.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. SCHALL with Mr. HOEY.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. KETTNER.

Mr. WARD with Mr. MILLIGAN.

Mr. SWOPE with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. SIEGEL with Mr. SABATH.

Mr. SANFORD with Mr. ROMJUE.

Mr. JAMES of Michigan with Mr. DREWRY.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan with Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. HULINGS with Mr. MAHER.

Mr. VOLK with Mr. CANTRILL.

Mr. BAER with Mr. HULL of Tennessee.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. SNELL with Mr. MOORE of Virginia.

Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. FERRIS.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.

Mr. VARE with Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. HARRELD with Mr. UPSHAW.

Mr. REED of West Virginia with Mr. CAREW.

Mr. BRITEN with Mr. O'CONNELL.

Mr. FOCHT with Mr. GALLIVAN.

Mr. NOLAN with Mr. MCKINIRY.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. IGOE.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana with Mr. CULLEN.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. WISE.

Mr. ROWE with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.

Mr. COPLEY with Mr. MCGLENNON.

Mr. LITTLE with Mr. WHALEY.

Mr. MACGREGOR with Mr. MEAD.

Mr. HULL of Iowa with Mr. MAJOR.

Mr. EMERSON with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. BURKE with Mr. McLANE.

Mr. HILL with Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY.

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. MOON.

Mr. MOTT with Mr. MANN of South Carolina.

Mr. BEGG with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. OVERSTREET.

Mr. McCULLOCH with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no," but I am paired with the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. KINCHELOE, and I desire to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the amendment.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 169, nays 150, answered "present" 5, not voting 103, as follows:

## YEAS—169.

Almon	Echols	Lehlbach	Sisson
Aswell	Evans, Mont.	Longworth	Slomp
Ayres	Fields	McDuffie	Small
Bacharach	Fisher	McKeown	Smith, Idaho
Bankhead	Flood	McKinley	Smithwick
Barkley	Focht	McPherson	Steagall
Bee	Fordney	Martin	Stedman
Bell	Ganly	Mason	Steenerson
Benham	Gard	Mays	Stephens, Ohio
Blackmon	Garner	Miller	Stevenson
Bland, Ind.	Garrett	Minahan, N. J.	Stiness
Boies	Goodall	Moore, Ind.	Stoll
Bowers	Goodykoontz	Murphy	Sweet
Bowling	Greene, Mass.	Nelson, Mo.	Taylor, Ark.
Brand	Griffin	Newton, Minn.	Taylor, Colo.
Briggs	Hadley	Newton, Mo.	Taylor, Tenn.
Brinson	Hardy, Colo.	Nicholls	Thomas
Brooks, Ill.	Hardy, Tex.	O'Connor	Thompson
Brooks, Pa.	Harrell	Oldfield	Tillman
Brumbaugh	Hastings	Oliver	Timberlake
Burke	Hays	Osborne	Tincher
Byrns, Tenn.	Hickey	Padgett	Vale
Campbell, Pa.	Houghton	Park	Venable
Candler	Howard	Phelan	Vestal
Caraway	Huddleston	Pou	Vinson
Carrs	Hudspeth	Quin	Voigt
Carter	Humphreys	Raker	Watkins
Clark, Fla.	Jacoway	Ramsey	Weaver
Classon	Jefferis	Randall, Calif.	Welty
Collier	Johnson, Miss.	Ransley	Whaley
Crisp	Keller	Rayburn	White, Kans.
Dale	Kendall	Rhodes	Wilson, La.
Davey	King	Ricketts	Wilson, Pa.
Davis, Minn.	Kreider	Riddick	Wingo
Davis, Tenn.	Lampert	Robison, Ky.	Woods, Va.
Dent	Langley	Rosenberg	Woodyard
Dickinson, Mo.	Lanham	Rouse	Wright
Dominick	Lankford	Rubey	Yates
Doughton	Larsen	Sanders, La.	Young, Tex.
Drane	Layton	Sanders, N. Y.	Zihlman
Dupré	Lazaro	Sears	
Dyer	Lee, Calif.	Sells	
Eagle	Lee, Ga.	Sims	

## NAYS—150.

Ackerman	Dunn	Kearns	Porter
Anderson	Eagan	Kelley, Mich.	Purnell
Andrews, Md.	Edmonds	Kelly, Pa.	Radcliffe
Andrews, Nebr.	Elliot	Kinkaid	Ramseyer
Anthony	Ellsworth	Klecza	Randall, Wis.
Ashbrook	Elston	Knudson	Reavis
Barbour	Esch	Kraus	Reber
Benson	Evans, Nebr.	Linthicum	Reed, N. Y.
Black	Fairfield	Luce	Rogers
Bland, Va.	Fess	Lufkin	Rose
Blanton	Fish	Luhling	Scott
Box	Foster	McAndrews	Shreve
Britten	Frear	McArthur	Sinclair
Browne	Freeman	McFadden	Sinnott
Buchanan	French	McKenzie	Snyder
Burdick	Fuller	McLaughlin, Mich.	Strong, Pa.
Burrhoughs	Glynn	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Summers, Wash.
Byrnes, S. C.	Godwin, N. C.	McLeod	Summers, Tex.
Campbell, Kans.	Good	Madden	Swindall
Cannon	Gould	Magge	Temple
Chindblom	Graham, Ill.	Mann, Ill.	Tilson
Christopherson	Green, Iowa.	Mansfield	Towner
Clark, Mo.	Greene, Vt.	Mapes	Treadway
Coady	Hamilton	Merritt	Volstead
Cole	Hawley	Michener	Walsh
Connally	Hayden	Monahan, Wis.	Walters
Cooper	Hernandez	Mondell	Wason
Crago	Hersey	Montague	Watson
Cramton	Hicks	Moore, Ohio	Webster
Crowther	Hoch	Neely	Welling
Currie, Mich.	Husted	Ogden	Wheeler
Curry, Calif.	Hutchinson	Paige	White, Me.
Darrow	Ireland	Parker	Williams
Dempsey	Johnson, S. Dak.	Parrish	Willson, Ill.
Denison	Johnson, Wash.	Patterson	Winslow
Dickinson, Iowa	Jones, Pa.	Pell	Young, N. Dak.
Dowell	Jones, Tex.	Perlman	
Dunbar	Kahn	Peters	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5.

Dallinger	McClintic	Sherwood	Strong, Kans.
Haugen			



## NOT VOTING—105.

Babka	Griest	McKinry	Rowe
Baer	Hamill	McLane	Rucker
Begg	Harrison	MacGregor	Sabath
Bland, Mo.	Hersman	Maher	Sanders, Ind.
Butler	Hill	Major	Sanford
Caldwell	Hoey	Mann, S. C.	Schall
Cantrill	Holland	Mead	Schully
Carew	Hulings	Milligan	Siegel
Casey	Hull, Iowa	Moon	Smith, Ill.
Cleary	Hull, Tenn.	Mooney	Smith, Mich.
Copley	Igoe	Moore, Va.	Smith, N. Y.
Costello	James, Mich.	Mott	Snell
Cullen	James, Va.	Mudd	Steele
Dewalt	Johnson, Ky.	Nelson, Wis.	Stevens, Miss.
Donovan	Johnston, N. Y.	Nolan	Sullivan
Dooling	Juul	O'Connell	Swope
Doremus	Kennedy, Iowa	Olney	Tague
Drewry	Kennedy, R. I.	Overstreet	Tinkham
Emerson	Kettner	Rainey, Ala.	Upshaw
Evans, Nev.	Kless	Rainey, Henry T.	Vare
Ferris	Kincheloe	Rainey, John W.	Volk
Gallagher	Kitchin	Reed, W. Va.	Ward
Gallivan	Leshner	Riordan	Wise
Gandy	Little	Robinson, N. C.	Wood, Ind.
Goldfogle	Loneragan	Romjue	
Goodwin, Ark.	McCulloch	Rowan	
Graham, Pa.	McGlennon		

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. LITTLE (for) with Mr. STRONG of Kansas (against).

Mr. GRIEST (for) with Mr. BUTLER (against).

Mr. KINCHELOE (for) with Mr. SHERWOOD (against).

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina (for) with Mr. DALLINGER (against).

Mr. JAMES of Virginia (for) with Mr. HOLLAND (against).

Mr. RAINEY of Alabama (for) with Mr. MCCLINTIC (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. UPSHAW.

Mr. JUUL with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. KLESS with Mr. GALLIVAN.

Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.

Mr. MORIN with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. WARD with Mr. BLAND of Missouri.

Mr. SANFORD with Mr. DONOVAN.

Mr. HULINGS with Mr. STEEL.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana with Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. BABKA.

Mr. NOLAN with Mr. CLEARY.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. GANDY.

Mr. ROWE with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. COPLEY with Mr. LESHNER.

Mr. HULL of Iowa with Mr. DOOLING.

Mr. MCCULLOCH with Mr. EVANS of Nevada.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on this call I voted "no." I have a pair with the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. LITTLE, who is absent on a funeral party. I desire to withdraw my vote of "no" and answer "present."

The name of Mr. STRONG of Kansas was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. RAINEY. I voted "no." I wish to withdraw that vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. MCCLINTIC was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma desire a separate vote on all of the amendments?

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Yes; I renew the request.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 47, after line 5, insert:

"For the care and maintenance of the Government kelp plant at Summerland, Calif., \$5,000: *Provided*, That at any time during the fiscal year 1922 or thereafter, when the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine that the interests of the Government will be subserved thereby, he is hereby authorized to appraise the buildings, machinery, marine equipment, kelp harvesters, boats, leasehold or contract rights, and all other property of whatever nature or kind appertaining to the experimental kelp potash plant of the Department of Agriculture situated at Summerland, Calif., and to sell the same at public or private sale, at such price or prices, on such terms, and in such manner as he may deem for the best interests of the Government, and in consummation thereof to execute such instruments of conveyance as may be requisite, the proceeds from such sale to be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 49, line 21, after the word "fly," insert the word "grasshopper," and in line 22, strike out the figures "\$150,660" and insert in lieu thereof "\$175,660."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 54, line 1, after the word "destroying," insert the words "mountain lions," and on page 54, line 1, after the word "coyotes," insert the word "bobcats."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Page 73, line 2, after the word "farms," insert "in cooperation with the States Relations Service or Federal, State, and local agencies."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 78, after line 8, insert:

"Acquisition of additional forest lands: There is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the provisions of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L., 961), as amended, for the acquisition of additional lands at headwaters of navigable streams, \$1,000,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Is this amendment to appropriate a million dollars to buy land on mountain tops?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman heard the amendment if he was listening, and he can interpret it. [Applause.]

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the ayes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 89, noes 89.

Mr. CANNON. How many were there in the affirmative?

The SPEAKER. On this vote the ayes are 89 and the noes 89.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 154, nays 146, answered "present" 2, not voting 127, as follows:

## YEAS—154.

Almon	Eagle	Lufkin	Seats
Anderson	Esch	Luhning	Sells
Aswell	Evans, Mont.	McArthur	Sinclair
Bankhead	Fields	McClintic	Sinnot
Barkley	Fisher	McDuffie	Slomp
Bell	French	McKeown	Small
Benson	Fuller	Madden	Smithwick
Bland, Va.	Garrett	Mansfield	Stegall
Bowers	Goodykoontz	Mapes	Stedman
Bowling	Graham, Ill.	Martin	Stevenson
Brand	Greene, Mass.	Mays	Stinnes
Brinson	Greene, Vt.	Merritt	Stoll
Britten	Hadley	Miller	Taylor, Ark.
Browne	Hardy, Tex.	Minahan, N. J.	Taylor, Tenn.
Brumbaugh	Hawley	Moore, Ind.	Temple
Burdick	Hayden	Morin	Tillman
Burroughs	Hays	Newton, Minn.	Tilson
Byrnes, S. C.	Hickey	Nicholls	Timberlake
Byrns, Tenn.	Hicks	O'Connor	Tincher
Campbell, Pa.	Holland	Ogden	Vaile
Candler	Howard	Oldfield	Venable
Caraway	Huddleston	Oliver	Vinson
Carss	Hudspeth	Padgett	Voigt
Clark, Fla.	Husted	Park	Volstead
Classon	Ireland	Peters	Walters
Collier	Jacoway	Phelan	Wason
Crago	Johnson, Miss.	Pou	Watkins
Cramton	Kahn	Purnell	Weaver
Crisp	Keller	Raker	Webster
Dale	Kless	Randall, Calif.	Welling
Dallinger	Klecza	Randall, Wis.	Whaley
Davey	Knutson	Ransley	Wilson, La.
Davis, Minn.	Langley	Reber	Wilson, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	Lankford	Reed, N. Y.	Wingo
Denison	Larsen	Robison, Ky.	Woods, Va.
Dominick	Lazaro	Rodenberg	Wright
Doughton	Lea, Calif.	Rogers	Young, Tex.
Drane	Lee, Ga.	Rubey	
Dupré	Luce	Sanders, La.	

## NAYS—146.

Ackerman	Currie, Mich.	Goodall	Kraus
Andrews, Md.	Curry, Calif.	Gould	Kreider
Andrews, Nebr.	Darrow	Green, Iowa	Lampert
Anthony	Dickinson, Iowa	Griffin	Lanham
Ashbrook	Dickinson, Mo.	Hamilton	Layton
Bacharach	Dowell	Hardy, Colo.	Leibach
Barbour	Dunbar	Harrell	Linthicum
Black	Dunn	Harrison	Longworth
Bland, Ind.	Dyer	Hastings	McFadden
Blanton	Eagan	Haugen	McKenzie
Boles	Edmonds	Hernandez	McKinley
Box	Elliott	Hersey	McLaughlin, Mich.
Briggs	Ellsworth	Hoch	McLaughlin, Nebr.
Brooks, Ill.	Elston	Houghton	McLeod
Buchanan	Evans, Nebr.	Hutchinson	Magee
Burke	Fairfield	Jefferis	Mann, Ill.
Campbell, Kans.	Fess	Johnson, S. Dak.	Mason
Cannon	Fish	Johnson, Wash.	Michener
Carter	Focht	Jones, Pa.	Monahan, Wis.
Christblom	Fordney	Jones, Tex.	Montague
Christopherson	Foster	Juul	Moore, Ohio
Coady	Frear	Kearns	Murphy
Cole	Freeman	Kendall	Neely
Cooper	Ganly	King	Nelson, Mo.
Crowther	Garner	Kinkaid	Osborne

Paige  
Parker  
Parrish  
Patterson  
Pell  
Perlman  
Porter  
Quinn  
Radcliffe  
Ramsey  
Ramseyer  
Reavis

Rhodes  
Ricketts  
Riddick  
Rose  
Rouse  
Sanders, N. Y.  
Scott  
Sherwood  
Shreve  
Sisson  
Snyder  
Steensson

Stephens, Ohio  
Strong, Kans.  
Strong, Pa.  
Summers, Wash.  
Sweet  
Swindall  
Taylor, Colo.  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Towner  
Treadway  
Vestal

Walsh  
Watson  
Wheeler  
White, Kans.  
White, Me.  
Williams  
Winslow  
Yates  
Young, N. Dak.  
Zihlman

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Humphreys Sumners, Tex.

## NOT VOTING—127.

Ayres  
Babka  
Baer  
Bee  
Begg  
Benham  
Blackmon  
Bland, Mo.  
Brooks, Pa.  
Butler  
Caldwell  
Cantrill  
Carew  
Casey  
Clark, Mo.  
Cleary  
Connally  
Copley  
Costello  
Cullen  
Dempsey  
Dent  
Dewalt  
Donovan  
Dooling  
Doremus  
Drewry  
Echols  
Emerson  
Evans, Nev.  
Ferris  
Flood

Gallagher  
Gallivan  
Gandy  
Gard  
Glynn  
Godwin, N. C.  
Goldfogle  
Good  
Goodwin, Ark.  
Graham, Pa.  
Griest  
Hamill  
Hersman  
Hill  
Hoey  
Hulings  
Hull, Iowa  
Hull, Tenn.  
Igoe  
James, Mich.  
James, Va.  
Johnson, Ky.  
Johnston, N. Y.  
Kelley, Mich.  
Kelly, Pa.  
Kennedy, Iowa  
Kennedy, R. I.  
Kettner  
Kincheoloe  
Kitchin  
Leshner  
Little

Louergan  
McAndrews  
McCulloch  
McGlennon  
McKinley  
McLane  
McPherson  
MacGregor  
Maher  
Major  
Mann, S. C.  
Mead  
Milligan  
Mondell  
Moon  
Mooney  
Moore, Va.  
Mott  
Mudd  
Nelson, Wis.  
Newton, Mo.  
Nolan  
O'Connell  
Olney  
Overstreet  
Rainey, Ala.  
Rainey, Henry T.  
Rainey, John W.  
Rayburn  
Reed, W. Va.  
Riordan  
Robinson, N. C.

Romjue  
Rowan  
Rowe  
Rucker  
Sabath  
Sanders, Ind.  
Sanford  
Schall  
Scully  
Siegel  
Sims  
Smith, Idaho  
Smith, Ill.  
Smith, Mich.  
Smith, N. Y.  
Snell  
Steele  
Stephens, Miss.  
Sullivan  
Swope  
Tague  
Tinkham  
Upshaw  
Vare  
Volk  
Ward  
Welty  
Wilson, Ill.  
Wise  
Wood, Ind.  
Woodyard

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. BENHAM with Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. MONDELL with Mr. MOORE of Virginia.

Mr. GLYNN with Mr. JAMES of Virginia.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri with Mr. RAYBURN.

Mr. VARE with Mr. BEE.

Mr. GOOD with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho with Mr. KINCHELOE.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. UPSHAW.

Mr. MCPHERSON with Mr. HUMPHREYS.

Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania with Mr. FERRIS.

Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. CONNALLY.

Mr. LITTLE with Mr. BLACKMON.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. GALLIVAN.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania with Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina.

Mr. BUTLER with Mr. DEWALT.

Mr. GRIEST with Mr. AYRES.

Mr. ECHOLS with Mr. DOREMUS.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BLANTON. The vote having been so close and also the majority leader just having come in, is it in order to move to reconsider?

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. BLANTON. He did not get to vote, and I want to give him an opportunity to do so.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not debate the question.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, it is only in order for one who voted against the amendment to make the motion.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not vote against it, but I did not know but that some one who voted against it wanted to change.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 79, after line 3, insert: "Experiments and demonstrations in live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the authorities of the States concerned, or with individuals, to make such investigations and demonstrations as may be necessary in connection with the development of live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States, \$51,500."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WALSH. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 110, noes 23.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-eight gentlemen are present, a quorum. The ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 79, after line 23, insert:

"Passenger-carrying vehicles: That not to exceed \$60,000 of the lump-sum appropriations herein made for the Department of Agriculture shall be available for the maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of the field work of the Department of Agriculture outside the District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 84, line 15, after the words "and to provide means for the," insert the words "study and experimentation in eradication, and for the."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. Mr. JONES of Texas and Mr. BLANTON rose.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am against the bill. I do not know whether my colleague is against it or not.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] against the bill?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I am.

The SPEAKER. The Chair presumes that both the gentlemen are desirous to make a motion to recommit. Does any other gentleman desire to make such a motion? If not, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers a motion to recommit, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES of Texas moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendments: On page 4, line 12, strike out the figures "\$325,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$150,000"; on page 71, line 16, under the appropriation for the Bureau of Markets, strike out the figures "\$390,160" and insert in lieu thereof "\$565,160."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to ordering the previous question.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 250, noes 10.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I demand a reading of the engrossed copy.

The SPEAKER. The engrossed copy has already been read. The bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. ANDERSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

## RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING,  
Washington, January 25, 1921.

Hon. FREDERICK H. GILLET,

Speaker House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I wish to respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the following committees: Printing, Joint Committee on Printing, Elections No. 1. I am,

Sincerely, yours,

JAS. V. MCCLINTIC.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.



## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MOORE of Virginia (at the request of Mr. BLAND of Virginia), for to-day, on account of absence from city on public business.

To Mr. WEBSTER (at the request of Mr. MILLER), for the day, on account of sickness.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Agricultural appropriation bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the Agricultural appropriation bill just passed. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I made the statement yesterday that on account of the excessive cost and shortage of paper we are able to furnish each Member with only six bound copies of the RECORD. For that reason, until I can make a further investigation of this subject, I will be forced to object.

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend a speech which I made on the sundry civil bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McCLINTIC. If the gentleman will modify his request and simply ask unanimous consent to revise, I will have no objection to his revising.

Mr. PELL. I will so modify my request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's revising his remarks?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. Does a Member have to get the consent of the House before he can revise the remarks he has made?

The SPEAKER. It depends on the extent of the revision. The custom is that ordinary corrections which will improve the grammar and the rhetoric of the speech and not change its substance are permissible. Further than that, they are not.

Mr. WALSH. What is permissible under the gentleman's request to revise his remarks? What is permissible?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the right to revise without the consent of the House.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the request for revision of remarks is new. It has only occurred in the last few Congresses. Gentlemen have got into the habit of making such requests, asking unanimous consent to revise and extend their remarks.

It never used to be done, and ought not to be allowed in any case. An ordinary revision of grammar or rhetoric is made by most Members of the House, and I suppose properly made. I have no objection to it. But to give a man the right to change his remarks and the entire substance of them by revision ought never to be allowed. When such requests started a few years ago I objected, but I have quit objecting, because everybody seems to think that he has to ask unanimous consent to revise his remarks if he dotted an "i" or crossed a "t."

Mr. WINGO. In fact, the revision which the gentleman requests is not a revision, but an extension. The revision is simply to correct the form, but not the substance. Anything that goes further than that is not a revision, but an extension. A good many gentlemen have fallen into the habit of making extensions under requests for making a revision.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. At times such matters have been brought to my attention because my name was used in connection with them, and I found that gentlemen had fallen into the habit of rewriting their remarks because when they delivered them they could not use good grammar and good English. [Laughter.] It is desirable that there should be good grammar and good English used in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I wish it could be done oftener than it is.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## PURCHASE OF GERMAN AEROPLANES.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Military Affairs, I desire to report House resolution 648, which is a privileged resolution, and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER. Is this reported from the committee?

Mr. KAHN. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. It is a privileged report. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 648.

*Resolved*, That the Postmaster General, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy each be requested to report to the House the number of German aeroplanes purchased by his department in 1920, the fund out of which payment for such planes was made, the authority for their purchase, the agency through which such planes were purchased, the price paid per plane, the use to which these planes have been put, the number of such planes destroyed by fire or otherwise, the number of pilots killed as the result of such destruction, the number of planes of American make in the possession of the respective departments, and the number in use.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the resolution is not privileged.

Mr. KAHN. It calls for information, Mr. Speaker, for the use of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee will state his point of order.

Mr. GARRETT. As I caught it, Mr. Speaker, one point in there refers to the authority upon which the purchase was made. I take it that that calls for a legal opinion of some sort.

Mr. KAHN. It calls for information to be given to the House, and I think such resolutions are privileged.

Mr. GARRETT. If they call for facts, they are.

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is disposed to think that the authority would be a fact. The Secretary would refer to the statute, whatever the law was. The Chair would think that would be the natural interpretation of it.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. I understand this resolution was reported out by the committee this morning. I was present in the committee. I was inclined to agree, and still agree, that the question of authority is simply to point to the language of the law. It is a privileged matter, and as I understood the statement of facts before the committee the time has expired.

Mr. KAHN. It expires to-day.

Mr. DENT. It expires to-day, and the gentleman who offered the resolution would have had the privilege of calling it up if it is privileged.

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. DENT. Has not the Postmaster General fully answered for his department? I think it is just a question of delay.

Mr. KAHN. That is quite true; the report of the Postmaster General is in the RECORD of the day before yesterday.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. The making of the point of order did not indicate opposition on my part to the resolution. I do not know that there is any objection to the resolution, but it is to the interest of the House always that a resolution which in any way calls for an opinion from the head of an executive department, in my judgment, should not be passed. There is a good reason for the rule which confines these resolutions to calling for facts, and that reason is in no sense a partisan reason. The majority of the House would not be desirous, I should say, of calling for information which would call for arguments from the head of an executive department, whether of their party or any other party. My point of order on the resolution was made because I doubted its privileged character. I do not think it should be passed as a privileged resolution unless it clearly appears that it is privileged. I wonder if we could have it reported again?

The SPEAKER. The clause to which the gentleman refers is the authority for their purchase. The Clerk will again report the resolution.

The resolution was again read.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the expression touching the matter of authority calls for an opinion, and that the resolution is not privileged.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the authority upon which the Secretary acted is a matter of fact, and therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question—

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. The Postmaster General having already responded to all of the inquiries, and his answer having been incorporated in the RECORD, would it not be proper to amend the resolution so as to strike out the words "the Postmaster General"? What is the object of adopting a resolution of this kind, as to him, the House being already in possession of the information, and he having answered all the inquiries so far as they relate to his department?

Mr. KAHN. So far as the Postmaster General is concerned, he has sent to the chairman of the Committee on Military Af-

fairs a full statement regarding this matter. I have no objection to the suggested amendment.

Mr. BLACK. If the gentleman will yield, I will offer the amendment, or he can offer it.

Mr. KAHN. I ask unanimous consent that, in line 1, page 1, of the resolution, the words "the Postmaster General" be stricken out.

Mr. STEENERSON. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman if it has not been the practice heretofore strictly adhered to, that these resolutions of inquiry addressed to the heads of departments "direct" them to furnish the information? I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] made that point at the last session, and we do not want to place ourselves in the position of leaving it discretionary. We are entitled to receive information from these executive departments, and it seems to me the gentleman ought to change that by direction.

Mr. KAHN. I believe that if this resolution passes these gentlemen will furnish the House with the answers to the questions embraced in the resolution.

Mr. STEENERSON. But it places us in the position of requesting, when we are absolutely entitled to the information. The resolution offered in the last Congress was objected to on that ground, and we changed it.

Mr. KAHN. I will ask unanimous consent to insert the word, so that it will read that "each be requested and directed."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to offer an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KAHN: Page 1, line 1, after the word "that," strike out the words "the Postmaster General."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. KAHN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARNER. I did not make the point of order—but I believe it would have been good—that this resolution directs more than one head of a department to give information. If you pass this resolution, what head of a department will receive the official copy, and how are you going to get the request to the heads of the other departments from whom you desire information? The rules of the departments require that in seeking information we direct the request to the head of a department, and you can not combine it for two or more heads of departments, for the simple reason that you have no official copy to send to the head of more than one department.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Why not make as many official copies as you want? This is not engrossed.

Mr. GARNER. This is a resolution passed by the House of Representatives, and there is supposed to be one official copy.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It is not engrossed or enrolled. The Clerk could make 40 certified copies.

Mr. GARNER. How many official copies are there; as many as you desire to make?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It is not signed by the presiding officer.

Mr. GARNER. I know; but how many official copies are there; just as many as you desire to make?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. He can make as many official copies as are necessary.

Mr. GARNER. Who can?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Clerk of the House; and he can certify to them as official copies.

Mr. GARNER. I do not think the gentleman from Illinois is correct about that. If that is so, a dozen official copies of a resolution passed by the House of Representatives might be floating around anywhere.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Sure, there may be, certified to as having passed the House. There is no engrossed or enrolled copy. What is misleading the gentleman is the idea that there is an engrossed or enrolled copy.

Mr. KAHN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be further amended by inserting in line 2, page 1, after the word "be," the words "directed and."

Mr. DENT. Reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman from California will not insist on that. The usual form of resolution that we have reported out of the Committee on Military Affairs has been to request the head of the department. If the request is not complied with, then it will be time enough to direct.

Mr. STEENERSON. The uniform practice has been to direct. The House is entitled to this information as a matter of right, not as a matter of discretion with the heads of departments.

Mr. KAHN. I am rather inclined to agree with the gentleman from Minnesota that we can and do generally direct the heads of departments.

Mr. DENT. We can, but the usual courtesy is to request. Then we can see whether the request is complied with. I hope the gentleman from California will not insist on that amendment, because I hate to object to it.

Mr. STEENERSON. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. DENT. I will object if the request is insisted upon.

Mr. MASON. Let us wait and see if our request is complied with.

Mr. KAHN. I withdraw the request for the adoption of the amendment to insert the words "directed and," and move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. KAHN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

BOULEVARD, CHICKAMAUGA AND CHATTANOOGA MILITARY PARK.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 12502, which has passed the Senate, and I move to concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 12502. An act to provide for the report of the cost of improving and maintaining the Government boulevard on Missionary Ridge, Chickamauga and Chattanooga Military Park.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Judge Moon, is very much interested in this resolution. He is sick and unable to be here, but his secretary has communicated to me that it is Judge Moon's wish and desire that the House agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendments.

The question was taken, and the Senate amendments were agreed to.

On motion of Mr. KAHN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate amendments were agreed to was laid on the table.

QUAPAW INDIANS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to call attention to the fact that the bill H. R. 15780 was inadvertently referred to the Private Calendar on January 24. It is a class of bills that usually has been referred to the Union Calendar.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. What is the bill?

The SPEAKER. It refers to extending restrictions against alienation of land allotted and inherited by certain Quapaw Indians.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not think I shall object, but it belongs on the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has been informed that it refers to a tribe of Indians.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It refers to individual Indians. It refers to documents, and then by amendment, and the names are in the original document. I have no objection by unanimous consent to its being referred to the Union Calendar.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I have read the bill.

Mr. CARTER. These individuals constitute what remains of this Indian tribe.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That makes no difference.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be referred to the Union Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that it be referred to the Union Calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TELEGRAPH MESSAGES BY MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. On what subject?

Mr. IRELAND. I want to make an explanation to the Members of the House concerning the new program for telegraphic operations under the frank of Members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.



Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, all Members of the House have been advised by circular some time ago of the proposed change of operation or plan under which the Members have been permitted to send telegraphic communications on Government business under their congressional frank. It was proposed that because of the tremendous amount of bookkeeping and auditing and additional trouble the Western Union was put to that they request a change which might inconvenience Members in some degree. The plan has been perfected through the opportunity we have had for conferences, both with the representatives of the Senate and the House and officials of the Western Union Co. It has been our effort and we have striven to adjust the matter so that the Members of the House and the Senate would not in any way be greatly inconvenienced by the new arrangement that has been arrived at.

There will be practically no material change in the method employed so far as the membership of both Houses is concerned. The telegraphic communications sent from Washington by Members of the House and Senate will be sent as they have been in the past. A charge account will be arranged for every Member at his domicile, his home town, or place of residence, and a card will be issued to him, in addition, which he may produce and use for sending Government messages while traveling away from home. This charge account arranged at his home for Government business will be submitted to the respective disbursing offices of the two Houses, and not to him. Such messages as he may send while away from home when traveling will be forwarded to the Washington office and there transferred to the respective disbursing offices of the two Houses.

I have taken this time because so many inquiries have been made by Members, provoked by the proposed change. As I say, the membership will not be disturbed in any material manner from the former practice.

If my time permits I would like to congratulate the membership of the House in the cooperation in our efforts for economy and against the former abuses of this program. The fiscal year of 1920 shows nearly 50 per cent reduction in messages over the fiscal year 1919. If the present year bears out the apparent indications, we will reach a further reduction of 25 to 30 per cent.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Out of fairness to the membership, does not the gentleman think he ought to state that 1919 was probably one of the worst years Congress ever experienced in the use of the telegraph? For instance, in regard to the returning of soldiers from abroad, 1919 was the worst year I ever experienced since I have been in Congress.

Mr. IRELAND. I agree with the gentleman, and I think I have stated previously on the floor that same thing, and forcibly, and I regret that the attitude of my remarks were of such insignificance that the gentleman does not remember them.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Certainly.

Mr. DYER. Under the new arrangement will the Members indicate on the messages whether they are Government business, or will the committee decide that?

Mr. IRELAND. They certainly must, in their own opinion.

Mr. DYER. The Members must continue to do that?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes. The court of last resort will still be the committee. I might state in that connection that in the last batch of telegrams submitted to the Committee on Accounts there were but three violations of the rule committed in the House, and I am sure that those were unintentional.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. LARSEN. Suppose a Member receives a message from a constituent, marked "Collect," and it is a Government message, what is he going to do with that?

Mr. IRELAND. The practice has been in the past to allow that. That should not be encouraged; it should be avoided as much as possible. I think that will continue. There is nothing in the new rule to make that impossible.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. Whom did I understand the chairman of the committee to say will be the judge of whether we should use the wire or mail in particular cases? Does the gentleman think that the Member should be the judge of that?

Mr. IRELAND. That has been the habit with Members in the past; he should be the judge himself. Of course, if there is a flagrant abuse perhaps the committee with whom authority is lodged might take cognizance of it. I hope, however, that that will be unnecessary.

Mr. McARTHUR. What about these telegrams that are sent collect to Members of Congress from applicants for political appointments? Are they official or private business?

Mr. IRELAND. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman's inquiry is entirely out of order. I have not heard of any such communications. [Laughter and applause.]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4039. An act to amend section 3 of the act of Congress of June 28, 1906, entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes";

S. 4719. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear and determine the claims of the owners of the Danish steamship *Flynderborg* against the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 248. Joint resolution relieving and discharging from the fine imposed by law and authorizing the payment of messengers appointed by the electors of certain States to deliver the electoral vote of such States for President and Vice President.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 440. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of War to cease enlisting men in the Regular Army of the United States, except in the case of those men who have already served one or more enlistments therein;

H. R. 4184. An act for the relief of C. V. Hinkle;

H. R. 974. An act for the relief of W. T. Dingler; and

H. R. 11769. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolution of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 248. Joint resolution relieving and discharging from the fine imposed by law and authorizing the payment of messengers appointed by the electors of certain States to deliver the electoral votes of such States for President and Vice President; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. WALSH of Montana and Mr. FRANCE members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the War Department.

The message also announced that Mr. NELSON was excused on his own request from further service as a conferee on the bill (H. R. 13931) entitled "An act to authorize association of producers of agricultural products," and Mr. WALSH of Montana was appointed in his place.

#### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the gentleman desires to discuss a somewhat personal matter?

Mr. GARNER. Somewhat, yes.

Mr. ROGERS. I shall not object in this instance, but I feel obliged to serve notice that I shall object to any further requests for permission to address the House this afternoon.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma objects.

#### DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15872, the

Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, and, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to two hours, one-half to be controlled by myself and one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill. Pending that, he asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to two hours, one-half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL]. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from North Carolina is in the Committee on Appropriations at present. Has the gentleman from Massachusetts talked with him respecting this?

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman from North Carolina is agreeable to an hour on a side. I assume that he will be on the floor in a moment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes. I have no objection.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if it is possible for him to spare me 10 minutes of his time, or has all of the time been allotted?

Mr. ROGERS. The time is pretty well allotted, but if the gentleman could pick up five minutes from his side, I should be very glad to give him five minutes from this side, and, so far as I am personally concerned, I should be very glad to give him the first period, as I understand he desires to leave the floor to attend a meeting of his committee.

Mr. GARNER. Yes; our committee meets at 2.30 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I make this reservation for the purpose of asking a question, is it intended that remarks made on this bill shall be confined to the bill?

Mr. ROGERS. There has been no arrangement of that kind. I understand a number of gentlemen desire to discuss subjects that are foreign to the bill itself.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much, but I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Diplomatic appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Diplomatic appropriation bill, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. ROGERS. I also ask unanimous consent that in the event that I be recognized by the Chair, and in the event that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] be recognized by the Chair subsequently, we may have the privilege of allotting our time as we see fit.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the time used by him may be allotted, and also that the time used by the gentleman from South Carolina may be allotted, should he be recognized. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, have not the gentlemen, if they are recognized by the Chair, that right under the rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts would as soon as the Chair recognizes him.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And I assume that if the Chair should subsequently recognize the gentleman from North Carolina, he would have the same privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be the case.

Mr. ROGERS. Then, I withdraw the request and I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], provided I am recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for one hour. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I desire to extend my thanks to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] for giving me this time. As gentlemen probably know, the Ways and Means Committee is now having hear-

ings, and it is seldom that a member of that committee can be here for the purpose of discussing matters that they might want to bring to the attention of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked your indulgence this morning for the purpose of making clear my position touching the policy of levying duties through the customhouse. I would not thus have imposed myself upon the House at this time had it not been that my position has been criticized and I believe misunderstood since the passage of the emergency tariff bill.

It might not be out of place to compare the necessities of the Government in the matter of funds necessary to conduct its business under present conditions with those prior to the war. The best informed men advise us that it will be necessary to collect around \$4,000,000,000 each year for the next four or five years in order to meet the necessary expenses of the Government, whereas prior to the war around \$1,000,000,000 was the sum collected. When we only needed a billion dollars a year with which to conduct the Government's business a greater proportion of it was collected through the customhouse than from any other source, and more than 80 per cent of the total was derived from custom duties and excise on liquor and tobacco. During the war we resorted to all kinds of taxes, so I believe we should approach the subject now with a view of establishing a permanent policy of taxation upon a peace basis, and since the necessities are more than four times what they were prior to the war, we necessarily approach the question from a new and different angle to that existing prior to the war. Now, how should we collect the money to run the Government in view of these additional necessities and new world conditions? For my part, I believe that the major portion should be collected from those best able to pay, the lesser percentage should be levied upon the masses of the people. I do not believe that it would be a healthy Government that would undertake to collect the entire revenue necessary for the conduct of its business from the classes and nothing from the masses. Therefore I shall advocate a taxing policy whereby the smaller proportion of the revenue necessary to run the Government may be collected from the whole people. The next question comes, How shall the smaller percentage of the taxes referred to be collected? For more than a hundred years this country has been levying a tariff through the customhouse on goods imported from abroad. It is such a well-established policy that I doubt if any intelligent man who has given the matter a moment's thought would advocate its discontinuance; so admitting that we are to go to the customhouse to get this tax which is to be levied upon the goods consumed by the people, the next question arises, What policy shall we adopt in collecting that tax? I am a Democrat, and I believe in applying democratic methods at the customhouse—all should be treated alike, with special favors to none.

There are two schools of thought, or rather there are three schools of thought or belief in this country touching the customhouses. One is the free trader who believes that the customhouses should be eliminated. Another equally as unreasonable in my judgment, is the man like our distinguished chairman, [Mr. FORNEY] from Michigan, who would place the tariff wall so high that no foreigner would dare undertake to share the American market with the American producer. Either of these policies in my judgment at this time would be commercial suicide and I venture the assertion that there is not 20 per cent of the American people who would advocate either of these policies; and yet we find men in Congress who are supposed to have investigated the subject that advocate each of these policies. This brings me to the point of stating what my individual views are touching the subject of levying taxes through the customhouse. As I stated before, I would treat all imports as nearly alike in the levying of duties as possible. I mean by that that I would seek from the best information to be had a competitive rate and place that rate in the law. Of course, that rate would vary according to the facts in each case. That rate of duty, if I am correctly informed—and I would like for some gentleman to correct me if I am not—is the rate of duty that will get the largest amount of money in the Treasury. Now, if that is not good democracy—if that position is undemocratic—I want some gentleman to rise in his place and tell me why. A Democrat can never go above a competitive rate, while a Republican, if he is true to his protective theories, must give a higher rate or else he fails to give that degree of protection that he so vehemently promised to give in the last campaign.

In levying a duty upon noncompetitive articles, one must be governed by his judgment of general conditions as to how much revenue is to be derived from that particular article. I know it is advocated by some Democrats and most of the Republicans that a tariff should be levied upon the manufactured article and that the products of the farm and ranch and raw materials



should come in free. I can not subscribe to this doctrine. If I am going to the customhouses for the purpose of getting revenue to run the Government, I can see no reason why I should not collect money from the importation of farm and ranch as well as raw material along with the collection for the manufactured article. Any rate of duty levied at the customhouse gives the American producer that much advantage over the foreigner who sells his goods in this market. So it seems to me unfair, unjust, and indefensible to say to the manufacturer that "we propose to give you an advantage over the foreigner by levying a tax on his goods when he comes to the customhouse" and at the same time tell the farmer and the stockman "your competitor can come with his farm and ranch products free; we want no revenue to run the Government from that source." It was once said that no duty was needed on farm products either for protection or revenue, but that statement can not be made now, since the records in the Treasury Department show that great volumes have been coming in both for years 1919 and 1920. I am going to be venturesome enough to ask why we should not have received some revenue from that immense importation of farm products? Why should there not be a revenue duty on these things as well as a revenue duty upon the manufactured products? I can not find a satisfactory answer to these questions. I wonder if there is a logical answer?

Now, that brings me to the emergency tariff bill that passed the House of Representatives some weeks ago and for which I voted.

The report shows that that bill was reported by the committee as an emergency measure, and in no way expressed the views either of Republicans or Democrats as to what should be the permanent rates of duty to be levied upon these articles. The report shows that the bill was not offered as a permanent taxing policy, and that the rates had not been scientifically ascertained either from a protective standpoint or revenue standpoint; but they were merely thrown together, and the passage of the bill asked in the hope that market conditions might be stabilized with a view of preventing wreck and ruin, bankruptcy, and chaos in the agricultural sections of the country. That those conditions existed there, there is not any doubt, and I was willing to pass this emergency measure believing, as I did, that it would tend to give the agricultural people an opportunity to adjust their financial situation and once more take heart and continue in their various pursuits of agriculture. In criticizing a Democrat for casting a vote for that bill, it must be upon the assumption that the rates were protective—that is to say, they were beyond a competitive maximum revenue producing rate; for surely a Democrat would have as much right to vote for a revenue duty on the articles named in the emergency tariff bill as some other Democrat would to vote for a revenue rate on a like number of manufactured articles, and you know we have all been guilty of that.

I do not know and do not believe anyone else knows whether the various rates were protective or revenue rates. A mere declaration that one knows a rate is a protective or a revenue rate is not sufficient. He must, or, at least, should know wherein it is one or the other.

If 3 cents per pound on peanuts—the highest percentage of increase of any rate in the bill—is a protective rate, it must exceed the cost of producing peanuts in China and in this country. If 3 cents per pound did not exceed the difference in the cost of production here and abroad, then it must have been in the neighborhood of a revenue rate; and while you may criticize my judgment in levying a tax upon that particular article, you can not, or, at least, you should not attack my democracy. Hearings have been had upon this subject since that bill passed. The proof shows—and it has not been challenged—that the average cost of producing peanuts in the United States for the year 1920 was about 7 cents per pound, and the proof is equally conclusive that peanuts were shipped into this country in the last few months and sold from 3½ to 4 cents per pound. So far as present conditions are concerned, these peanut politicians guessed about right.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to warn my Republican friends against the danger of putting up the tariff wall beyond competition. While they have pursued this policy in the past and have gained the confidence, at times, of the American people, if they adopt it in the year 1921 it will, in my judgment, result in materially destroying the export trade of this country and thereby lessen production, put labor out of employment, and do just the reverse of what they have claimed heretofore—that their protective wall was the panacea for all prosperity and all labor employment. You can not sell to foreign countries and not buy in return. They have nothing with which to pay for your goods except an exchange of their goods or products.

Every impediment you place in the way of their equal opportunity in this market goes that far in the direction of prohibiting them from buying our produce and, of course, to that extent

decreases our export trade. The ideal tariff, it seems to me, at this time would be a competitive tariff—and levy that rate in the customhouses which would result in giving the foreigner an equal opportunity with the American producer—and while our Republican friends are not willing to take that, but insist upon giving the American an unnecessary advantage, I have sufficient confidence in American industry to believe that he can not only compete successfully with the foreigner but can survive where others would fail if you will give him an equal and fair opportunity. You Republicans are going to consider a tariff bill. The Ways and Means Committee has been having hearings for weeks with a view of framing a bill to be submitted to the special session. I assert to you that it is utterly impossible at this time to ascertain the difference in the cost of production here and in foreign countries. Without that cost it is impossible for you to scientifically frame a tariff that will be based either upon the "protective" theory or "revenue-only" theory. Both Democrats and Republicans have, at least in the past 50 years, drawn all tariff bills having as their base the difference in the cost of production here and abroad. The hearings before the Dingley committee, the Wilson committee, the McKinley committee, the Payne committee, the Underwood committee, and the Fordney committee have each had for their purpose, as shown by the questions of the committee and the statements and briefs filed by their witnesses, that each and every one had for its base the ascertaining of the cost of production in this country and abroad. Therefore I repeat that without that fact being ascertained it is impossible to draw a scientific bill. The result is that you are going to pass a bill based upon prewar conditions or a mere guess as to what the rates should be at this time. Either one of them can not be definite, because they would both be guesses, for the reason that prewar conditions do not apply now and may not apply six months from now or a year or two years. You have only to compare the cost of raw material, the cost of transportation, the cost in labor now as compared with prewar conditions to convince any intelligent man—unless it be some Republican who has promised to revise the tariff—that you can not pass a scientific tariff at this time based upon prewar conditions; and we all know that the cost of production in this country even at this time has no stability, and that within six months or a year it will likely be materially reduced. So I say without fear of successful controversy that there is not a man living to-day who can draw a scientific tariff bill, because, after all we may say and do about tariff legislation, the rates that you put in the bill are the heart of it, and without these rates being based upon correct information it is impossible to write them.

Now, my Democratic colleagues, I was impelled to make this statement because some of my associates saw proper to criticize my position and go so far as to say that I was not a good Democrat. I may not be a good Democrat, but I hope you will find me to be an honest one and that I will always give you my honest views not only touching the tariff but any other subject. I am not a protectionist; neither am I a free trader. However, I realize that whenever you go to the customhouse to collect duties to run the Government, that just as you levy that duty through the customhouse so do you give the American producer the advantage over the foreigner. How much advantage is the only question involved, and that brings you to the rate that you will levy. I have told you that I would never go above a competitive rate; that rate which will bring the largest amount of money into the Treasury, and each schedule—yes, each paragraph and item—must be considered according to conditions as you find them when you undertake to write a bill. I have told you that I wanted to treat each article coming to the customhouse in a similar manner. That means that I would levy the tariff on the farm and ranch products as well as the manufactured article. I will never consent to a doctrine that requires part of the people to buy in a taxed market and sell in a free market.

It has been the contention of all Democrats that you could get more money from a revenue tariff than from a protective tariff. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind about the correctness of that position. Let me say in this connection that, in my judgment, the question of giving more liberal opportunities to the foreigner or more nearly approaching free trade will be one that will have very serious consideration by the best minds of this Nation within a decade. We are the greatest producing Nation on earth. You can not sell these products abroad unless you give the foreigner an opportunity to come to our market; and you can not do that and put the tariff wall to the point where he can not get in.

But, gentlemen, why should we become so much concerned about the method to be adopted in raising one-sixth or one-eighth of our revenue and so little to the other five-sixths or seven-



eighths? When we collected through the customhouse most of the money to run the Government, it was necessarily a paramount issue; but when you begin to collect direct from the people some three billions of dollars each year, you will quickly find where the principal division among the people will come in. Even at the present time nine men out of ten are talking internal-revenue taxes rather than tariff taxes. This tendency of the people to devote more consideration to internal-revenue taxation will increase, for the reason that when you take 80 cents direct from a man's pocket and 20 cents indirectly he is naturally going to give more attention to the 80 than he does to the 20, especially since the 20 is extracted without his knowledge and with a firm belief by many that you are doing him a favor. The acute division among the people and therefore between political parties on the question of methods to secure money to run the Government is going to be in the internal-revenue office rather than the customhouse.

We have already been warned by the high and mighty member of the steering committee from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] that in the Sixty-seventh Congress the Members elect from that territory east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio will undertake to legislate in the matter of taxation; meaning, of course, that they will arrange this system so as to be certain that their territory does not pay more than its share. We know that the present chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, as well as the members of this mysterious but all-powerful steering committee, whose habitats are in the territory referred to, favor what is known as the sales or turnover tax. Now, what does this mean? It means that you are going to shift the taxes from those best able to pay to the masses of the people, for, if you once adopt the sales or turnover tax, it will only be a matter of time until more than 80 per cent of the taxes necessary to run the Government will be collected in that manner. We only have to refer to the current press to see the drift of the minds of leading Republicans in this direction. When the wise men of the East have visited the high priest at Marion, Ohio, and talked taxes, they have invariably reported progress in the direction of removing the burdens of taxation, and especially those pertaining to surtaxes, excess profits, and even inheritance taxes. I am just wondering if they remove these burdens of taxes from those who are now bearing them where they are going to place them; and I am reminded by these same gentlemen that a turnover or sales tax would get the necessary funds to take their places. The Republicans always did believe that the people as a whole ought to pay the taxes, and while the Democrats have put upon the statute books during the last eight years a different policy these Republicans will go back to their old policy the first time they think it is safe to do so. As a party man I look forward with pleasure to that issue. [Applause.]

[During the delivery of Mr. GARNER's remarks his time expired and Mr. SMALL yielded him 12 minutes additional.]

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman yield for just a moment? I believe no agreement has been entered into for time in general debate. I was unfortunately in another committee at the time the bill was called up. I have demand for an hour and 25 minutes. Could we have an agreement—

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I raise the question that such an agreement can not be entered into in the committee. Under the rules of the House you will have to go back to the House to get an agreement on time.

Mr. ROGERS. Is the gentleman willing to let the two hours already arranged for run a little longer and then if it is possible we can rise and fix the time in the House?

Mr. SMALL. That is entirely agreeable. I had forgotten we were in Committee of the Whole House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has been already recognized for one hour.

Mr. SMALL. I think the chairman of the committee is first entitled to recognition, and I reserve the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was just informing the gentleman.

Mr. SMALL. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to be entirely candid with the House. A very large part of this bill is subject to points of order. Item after item is very clearly out of order or is at best doubtful if the question is raised.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I will.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is not that just another evidence that the existing method of making appropriations now employed is entirely an error, and that sooner or later we have got to find some way of remedying the rule which was adopted a couple of months ago?

Mr. ROGERS. I am not here as a defender or assailant of the new method of making appropriations, and if the gentleman will postpone his inquiry just a moment he will get a full understanding of my thought in this connection.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. In just a moment. Although these items are out of order, they have been carried year after year in the Diplomatic and Consular act in precisely the form in which they are now proposed. While technically there is no foundation of law for them, nevertheless it has been the practice of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the practice of the House and of the Congress to carry these items just as they are here recommended.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for just another question?

Mr. ROGERS. Certainly.

Mr. BRITTEN. Did the gentleman find it necessary to duplicate a lot of work in hearings and evidence before his subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that had already been heard by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which, of course, has to produce certain legislation in the event some one makes the point of order against matters in the bill before us which are subject to a point of order?

Mr. ROGERS. I think there has been a certain amount of duplication in the hearings. This being the first year under the new method of appropriation it was considered desirable to lay a very full foundation for the bill in the form of hearings before the Committee on Appropriations. I should say that the hearings, which this year number some 350 pages, are distinctly more voluminous than would have been necessary if the Committee on Foreign Affairs had continued the preparation of the bill this year.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. ROGERS. Certainly.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does the bill now before the committee make permanent legislation of a lot of legislation which was carried currently each year, as was suggested a few moments ago?

Mr. ROGERS. So far as I recall there is absolutely no attempt to convert into permanent authority any of the items which have been carried year after year. In other words, as far as these items are concerned, there is no attempt on the part of the Appropriations Committee to assume the prerogatives of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is, the bill does not intend to make permanent legislation of what heretofore has been current legislation?

Mr. ROGERS. So far as I recall, there has been no instance in which that has been done.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes; I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. On the question of passports there is an amendment suggested on which I gave notice in the Committee on Foreign Affairs I would make a point of order, because it contains new legislation.

Mr. FLOOD. That was stricken out.

Mr. ROGERS. The passport item in the bill before the committee at this moment is simply a five-line item of appropriation which is in order under existing law.

Mr. MASON. Do I understand, then, that the Committee on Appropriations has stricken out that provision which we were discussing in the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. ROGERS. The Committee on Appropriations can not be said to have stricken it out, because it was never reported by the Committee on Appropriations. It is true that in a preliminary print of the bill the question was considered of somewhat amplifying existing legislation; but so far as the Committee on Appropriations is concerned it has never acted along the line of legislation respecting passport control.

Mr. MASON. Then, as I understand the gentleman, that provision which was in the preliminary print for the convenience of Members is not included in the bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. ROGERS. That is entirely correct.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think, referring to the items which have just been discussed, that there was more excuse for the Committee on Foreign Affairs for exercising the power of legislating and embracing those items in the appropriation bill than there was for the Committee on Appropriations, which has no legislative power to put such items in an appropriation bill?

Mr. ROGERS. That is a matter of opinion. I should say that the propriety was about the same in each case, because the very fact that the Committee on Foreign Affairs had legislative



functions was, it seems to me, a natural reason why it should have reported out legislative matter in separate and permanent form.

Mr. FLOOD. My opinion and the gentleman's opinion do not agree on the question which I propounded. I am asking this: There is an item in the bill making an embassy of our mission to China. That has not been carried in any legislation.

Mr. ROGERS. That is true, and that is of a different category from the general classification I spoke of a few moments ago.

As I said to the House at the outset, there is no disposition whatever, so far as I am concerned, to try to put anything over on the House. In other words, I want to have entirely available all facts upon which the Committee on Appropriations has acted. On pages 4 and 5 of the report will be found the four or five instances where matter of a strictly legislative character is carried; and when I say "matter of a strictly legislative character" I distinguish it from the sort of items that have been carried year after year in the appropriation act and which are simply retained and continued in this measure which is before you to-day.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROGERS. If the gentleman will allow me to proceed for just one moment, I shall be glad to yield.

The items of a legislative character are these: First, the proposed raising of China from a legation to an embassy. I hope to discuss, at least briefly, the merits of that recommendation.

Second, the reduction of Austria from an embassy to two legations, one at Vienna and the other at Budapest. That may or may not be subject to a point of order. If the question is raised, I have some authorities which I think may lead the Chair to hold the recommendation to be in order. But it is nevertheless of a legislative character.

The third matter of this general description is the suggested reduction of Turkey from an embassy to a legation. That, I suppose, would be held clearly in order under the Holman rule, and so I presume it is proper matter for the Committee on Appropriations to present to the House. I have referred to it here only because I desire to have readily available for the committee the material of a new and strictly legislative character, whether in order or not, which is carried in the bill.

The fourth item of this character is the so-called International Research Council. For a good many years we have been carrying in the Diplomatic and Consular act yearly various appropriations for bodies of a scientific character. More and more in recent years those particular bodies had fallen under the control of the scientists of Germany. It is rather obvious, with conditions as they now are, that the majority of the countries of the world should view those older societies with a certain degree of suspicion. Within the last year or two the Entente Powers, including the United States, and some of the neutral powers have withdrawn altogether from the old societies and have formed the International Research Council. That, while not of a strictly governmental character, is at least semi-official, as evidenced by the fact that Dr. Charles D. Walcott, the head of the Smithsonian Institution, is the acting chairman on behalf of the United States of the International Research Council. The amount carried in the appropriation is something like \$2,500, and is about the sum, although in a different form, that was carried in segregated items in previous laws. But notwithstanding all this, it is perfectly clear, I suppose, that the item is subject to a point of order, because it is not authorized by existing law.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman said a while ago that the appropriations under this bill had been reduced about 25 per cent.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is informed of what additional fees have come into the State Department by reason of the increased passport and visé fees to \$10, showing that it does not involve as much money as the bill shows?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes. I am glad the gentleman has made that suggestion.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. PORTER. Is it not a fact that the increased passport and visé fees will provide enough revenue to make our foreign service practically self-sustaining?

Mr. ROGERS. That is correct. The appropriations carried in this bill are eight and one-half million dollars. The estimated revenue for the foreign service of the United States is \$9,807,000. The expense of maintaining the State Department

in Washington, which, of course, is not appropriated for in this bill, is about another million dollars. That is to say, during the current fiscal year, and as a result very largely of the increase in the passport and visé fees, the State Department, the Diplomatic Service, and the Consular Service, taken altogether, cost less than the amount of revenues which come into the State Department in the form of fees.

That, I think, is a matter that the House should consider in determining the proper scale of expenditures for this department, because, gentlemen, you will realize that if you reduce some of these items it involves a reduction in the resultant fees. Thus, in addition to the many other important functions and activities of the Department of State, it may be called a collecting agency for the United States; and if you cripple the collecting agency you of course cripple the ability to collect the very considerable revenue to which the gentleman from Maryland and the gentleman from Pennsylvania have referred.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOWELL. What is the actual reduction in this bill from the appropriation of last year?

Mr. ROGERS. About \$826,000.

Mr. DOWELL. Then, how does the gentleman get his comparison of reduction in this appropriation?

Mr. ROGERS. Because during the war the usual Diplomatic and Consular appropriation act carried about \$11,500,000 or \$12,000,000. That was the comparison that I was making.

Mr. DOWELL. But the real comparison with last year is only \$800,000?

Mr. ROGERS. In comparison with last year the reduction is \$826,000. It would be slightly over \$1,000,000 if it were not for the fact that we had to make one very considerable increase in connection with passport control.

Mr. DOWELL. Does the gentleman include the expenses referred to in the foreign embassies in Washington in the appropriation of last year?

Mr. ROGERS. I do not know what the gentleman means when he says "the foreign embassies in Washington."

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman stated a moment ago that there were many expenditures in Washington not included in the appropriation.

Mr. ROGERS. The expense of maintaining the Department of State is what I referred to.

Mr. DOWELL. That is not included in the last appropriation.

Mr. ROGERS. That is always carried in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill and has no relation to the comparison.

Mr. DOWELL. Then the actual amount of reduction is \$800,000.

Mr. ROGERS. It is \$826,000.

There is one more item of a legislative character that I want to refer to in conclusion on this particular point, and that is the so-called International Hydrographic Bureau, a new item in the bill this year. The creation of the bureau results from a request of the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of Commerce. An international conference was held in London recently at which delegates representing the United States Navy and the Department of Commerce were present. Hydrography is a science which, in order to be efficient, should be international in its character. In other words, the men who sail the seas, whether they are Americans or Frenchmen or Italians or Norwegians, need all of the information available about the hazards of the sea. There has never been up to this time an efficient international hydrographic service. The Department of State, as well as the other departments involved, have committed themselves as far as they have the right to commit themselves to the maintenance of this bureau. They ask for an appropriation of \$2,500, which seems to be a very moderate sum considering the utility and importance of the object to be attained.

And while, as I say, this is not authorized by law, it is an item of the type that has been carried in the Diplomatic and Consular bill for some years. The committee presents it for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole, with the full admission and realization that it can go out on a point of order if any Member feels that it ought not to remain in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. I have prepared in some detail a discussion of this bill, which I shall not take the time to inflict upon the House this afternoon, but I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record upon this bill.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to object, but I have objected to the extension of other remarks, and I hope the gentleman will not make the request.

Mr. ROGERS. If the gentleman will reserve his objection for a moment, I will say that the objections to which the gentleman from Oklahoma refers have been made upon matters foreign to the bill. This is strictly a discussion of the bill before the House, and it seems to me that it is not open to the same objection.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I hope the gentleman will not make that request at this time.

Mr. ROGERS. If the gentleman is going to object, it is of no use for me to make the request.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I hope the gentleman will withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire the Chair to submit the request?

Mr. ROGERS. I withdraw the request.

There is one item to which I should like to refer in this connection, and that is the item of appropriations for secretaries in the diplomatic service.

Mr. GARRETT. Will it interfere if I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. ROGERS. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman has referred to the change of law in the bill, providing for a minister to Austria and a minister to Hungary. Does the gentleman intend to discuss that any more on the floor?

Mr. ROGERS. I shall be very glad to answer any question.

Mr. GARRETT. What I had in mind was this: Of course, that is a recognition of a condition brought about by the war and provided for in the treaty of Versailles. Now, there were other nations set up by that treaty, and, as I understand, no ministers or other representatives of the United States are provided for in this bill to be sent to them.

Mr. ROGERS. Has the gentleman in mind such cases as Finland?

Mr. GARRETT. And Poland.

Mr. ROGERS. And Czechoslovakia and Jugoslavia?

Mr. GARRETT. I have.

Mr. ROGERS. Those nations exist as a result of the war and are all provided for in this bill.

Mr. GARRETT. I had overlooked that fact. Perhaps I had not read the bill as carefully as I should have read it before I interrogated the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS. In other words, we are seeking in this bill to recognize current history as far as the President of the United States and the Secretary of State think that Congress ought to go in keeping up with current history.

Let me now refer briefly to the matter of foreign-service secretaries and consuls, who are appropriated for in this bill. These men are not well paid and their functions are of an exceedingly delicate character. They have to be men of broad viewpoint and high education if they shall be enabled to do their work as it should be done. I think it is exceedingly important that the country should encourage the policy of promoting efficient secretaries and consuls in the Diplomatic Service to the rank of minister whenever an opportunity arises. I do not mean to say that every ambassador and minister of the United States should be appointed from the ranks of the secretaries or the ranks of the consuls. I do not mean to say that all secretaries and all consuls are fit to be ministers or ambassadors, but I do urge that for the ultimate welfare and efficiency of the service it is important that we should encourage as far as we may the policy of promoting these secretaries and consuls to the rank of minister.

I am aware that that is an executive function, and not one upon which Congress can directly legislate. But I think it would be wise, as far as practicable, to make these promotions from the Diplomatic and Consular Service.

Mr. Bryan, when he came into office in 1913, found many men promoted from secretary and consul filling the places of ministers and filling them well. He tipped out practically every one of them. For example, there were 11 men in Latin America alone who had risen by merit from the grade of secretary or consul to be ministers. Mr. Bryan dismissed every one of them and the service suffered greatly thereby.

I desire to pay tribute to the change of policy that was encouraged by Mr. Lansing from the moment when he became Secretary of State, and which we can infer has been continued by the present Secretary of State.

In the last two years there have been 8 or 10 vacancies in the rank of ministers. Every one of these, so far as I can recall, has been filled by men who had had some service background. Not every one had been a secretary or a consul, but six or eight were secretaries or consuls and had been promoted to ministers, and two or three men who had had valuable experience in the Department of State have been promoted in the

same way. The latter, however, should not be regarded as service promotions.

Mr. FLOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. Does the gentleman expect that policy to be pursued in the next administration?

Mr. ROGERS. I think it would be a calamity if these men who have been promoted on merit were not to be allowed to continue as ministers and ambassadors in the next administration. For that reason I want to go on record in advance.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I will.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Is there any provision made in this bill for deputy consuls?

Mr. ROGERS. Deputy consuls were abolished by law some years ago. During the last year or two, as the gentleman, who is a valued member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, knows, we have appointed young men as vice consuls of career. All of them are American citizens.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I realize that; but I wanted to know whether or not any provision has been made for additional salary, because I have received letters from young men saying that it is almost impossible to get along on the salary that they now receive.

Mr. ROGERS. It is the policy of the committee not to recommend any increase beyond the estimates. We have not reduced any salary appropriated for in this bill. There was no request or estimate for a single salary increase in the Consular Service, and therefore, whatever the Committee on Appropriations might otherwise have done, it did not feel at liberty to increase any consular salary.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. I was out of the Hall when the gentleman began his remarks. Has he touched upon the purchase of suitable buildings for embassies abroad?

Mr. ROGERS. I have not touched on that; I have dealt with it quite fully, however, in the course of some remarks, which I have prepared in explanation of the bill, but which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] feels constrained to exclude from the Record. I hope the gentleman may be willing to yield in the course of the afternoon, because I think my discussion on the point may be of value to Members of the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. If the remarks the gentleman refers to will throw any light on the matter of securing embassies abroad, I trust that my friend from Oklahoma will withdraw his objection.

Mr. ROGERS. There is an estimate before the Sixty-sixth Congress from the Secretary of State, dated October 31, 1919, House Document 290, which strongly recommends the purchase of an American embassy at Brussels. It has been my hope—and I regard it as a matter of great interest and importance—that we might at this time embark on a general policy of acquiring embassies and legations abroad. The matter of exchange makes it very desirable. In a single capital we can buy for \$75,000 a property that in a few years presumably will be worth a million dollars. There never has been anything like it in the history of the world and probably never will be again. In addition to the rare opportunity presented by the exchange situation, there is the further fact that most European countries owe us large sums of money.

In my judgment those countries will be perfectly willing to exchange a portion of their obligations to us in return for a suitable embassy or legation which they can turn over to us. I wish I could discuss the matter more fully, but I refer gentlemen who may be interested to my detailed remarks.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Why could not the gentleman read that part of his address?

Mr. ROGERS. Because I have promised to yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I prefer that the gentleman should ask unanimous consent for more time. Let him do that, and it will be granted him.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not care to do that. I do not care to take up the further time of the committee.

#### I. THE DUTIES OF OUR FOREIGN SERVICE.

The Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill as presented by the Committee on Appropriations to the House carries about eight and one-half million dollars. This sum is \$826,000 less than the appropriations for the current year and nearly three and one-half million dollars less than the amount requested in the estimates of the Secretary of State.

The problem of the committee has been to reduce appropriations as drastically as the present demands for economy make imperative without crippling the very important functions and



activities of our foreign service. I hope that the House will feel that this bill recommends a fair compromise between two entirely inconsistent extremes. If the bill errs, I believe it errs on the side of undue economy. I frankly think that an additional \$2,000,000 or more could, from the standpoint of the general national welfare, advantageously be added to the amount here recommended. That is, I believe that in this period of world readjustment any reasonable amount expended upon our foreign service is well expended.

But your committee necessarily took into account the history of the appropriations for the foreign service. As late as 1916 the Diplomatic and Consular act carried about four and one-half million dollars. Even in the years 1918, 1919, and 1920, when the international relationships of the world were so seriously disturbed by war conditions, the yearly appropriations ranged between ten and eleven million dollars. They have never reached the latter figure. When the new fiscal year begins next July the World War will have been over nearly three years. It seems reasonable and indeed inevitable that our foreign-service appropriations should be materially reduced below the amounts available during the years of especial stress.

The accompanying bill has been made up on this theory and shows a reduction of something like 25 per cent as compared with the war years. Even so, it is nearly twice as large as the usual prewar allotment. It must be recognized frankly that the Congress and the country can not expect at once, perhaps can not expect ever, a return to the figures of half a dozen years ago. The cost of maintaining our foreign service even on precisely the same scale which then prevailed has greatly increased in the last five years. This condition differs in no respect from the situation which prevails in Government and private disbursements within the United States. Furthermore, the aftermath of the war involves a vast increase in the amount and kind of work which the Nation requires of the foreign service. Along diplomatic lines the international relationships of the United States are more numerous, delicate, and complex than ever before. Along consular lines the duties imposed are very greatly enhanced as a result of the increased volume of our world trade and shipping.

Six years ago our total volume of exports and imports was less than \$4,500,000,000. For the calendar year 1920 this amount had risen to more than \$13,500,000,000—over three times the corresponding figure for 1915. This increase—and especially the increase in imports from \$2,000,000,000 to \$5,000,000,000—has thrown a great amount of additional work, both routine and investigative, upon the Consular Service and to some extent upon the Diplomatic Service. This is work which must be performed and which is essential to the orderly progress of American trade and prosperity.

In a somewhat similar field the obligations imposed upon the foreign service are multiplied many times. In 1910 the total tonnage of the American merchant marine engaged in foreign trade amounted to 1,173,776 tons. The fiscal year ended June 30, last, shows a corresponding figure of 15,692,631 tons. Our foreign trade has multiplied nearly 15 times in 10 years. Whenever an American vessel arrives at or leaves a foreign port the Consular Service at that port is called upon for important service which can not be evaded or delayed. The increase in personnel and facilities for the doing of this work has been inevitable and can not now advantageously be eliminated.

Another important and onerous duty which has recently for the first time been imposed upon the foreign service arises from the law requiring every person departing from a foreign country for the United States to bear a passport viséed by an American consular officer. I shall have more to say later concerning the value of this service and the desirability of continuing it. I wish at this time merely to call attention to the size of the undertaking involved in the scrutinizing of the passport of every immigrant, and the decision whether or not to grant the requisite visé. At this moment immigrants are coming to the United States at the rate of about 1,000,000 a year. The tremendous task of examining and deciding upon more than 1,000,000 cases yearly devolves upon the Consular Service and obviously necessitates a substantial increase in personnel and equipment of all kinds.

One fact should be borne in mind in considering this appropriation bill—the foreign service more than pays its own way. Aside from its important and indeed essential duties, it is an actual financial asset to the Government. The amount recommended in this bill, as I have stated, is about eight and one-half million dollars. During the current year the receipts from the foreign service will be something like \$10,000,000, one and one-half million dollars more than the appropriation. Many of the items contained in the bill really involve the payment for

the services of a collection agency. To cut down these items would simply result in decreased revenue to the Government. I desire to emphasize the fact that the Government not merely pays the entire expense of the State Department at home and abroad out of current revenues, but reaps a substantial profit besides. That is, the United States conducts its foreign intercourse and maintains its 50 or more diplomatic offices and 270 consular offices all over the world at an actual net gain to the taxpayer, and without a penny of expense for the innumerable and important services for the benefit of the Nation which result from the maintenance of our foreign establishment.

## II. PASSPORT CONTROL.

I have referred to the passport control question. The problem is before Congress at this moment—whether the system which has grown up requiring all aliens coming to the United States to receive the visé and sanction of an American consular officer before departure from their homes shall or shall not be continued. The cost of a visé is \$10 per person. With an immigration of any considerable size, the resulting revenue to be gained from the system is not to be despised. But probably the viewpoint of most Members of the House will depend upon whether, in their judgment, the system is otherwise defensible from the standpoint of the general welfare of the United States.

The law under which we are now operating was enacted on May 15, 1918. That law ceases to be in effect when formal peace comes. Another law (Public, No. 79, 66th Cong.), passed in the fall of 1919, purported to continue in effect portions of the act of May 15, 1918, until March 4 next. But as this law is not to become operative until the prior law ends by reason of the ending of the war, it has never come into effect and, as is morally certain, will never come into effect. Its only importance, therefore, is as indicating the apparent intention of Congress that passport control over immigration shall not be deemed a desirable thing in war time only; for, when Public Act No. 79 was passed, in the autumn of 1919, it was thought that peace would certainly have been achieved within a few weeks. Congress thus deemed passport control desirable in the reconstruction period following the war. That period is still present; probably the need of passport control, as evidenced by the millions of Europeans who seek to come to the United States, is greater than ever before. By its passage of the Johnson bill last December the House of Representatives took notice of the critical conditions of to-day and passed a temporary suspension measure. That bill, in section 3, perpetuated the passport control and visé system.

The Committee on Appropriations, in view of the emergency and of the legislative situation, and in spite of the fact that formal peace may bring to an end the act of May 15, 1918, even before the new fiscal year begins, deemed it a duty to appropriate for passport control for the coming year. The department for the current year has \$400,000 for passport control purposes. It asked for \$1,000,000. This bill recommends \$600,000. I believe that it would be a good investment for the United States to increase this sum. I believe that thereby would become possible a more searching inquiry into the character and fitness of prospective immigrants, which would certainly redound to the advantage of the United States.

But if the system is to be of real usefulness it must be given the sanction of legislative permanence which it is not in the power of the Committee on Appropriations to recommend. Changes in the law are equally imperative. The most urgent is one which shall give our consuls the right to refuse a visé in case the immigrant is obviously liable to exclusion under the immigration laws. At the moment the consul can refuse the visé only if the applicant would be dangerous to the institutions and Government of the United States. This is absurdly narrow and cuts down to a minimum the usefulness of the visé system. It is ridiculous that the consul should be compelled to grant a visé to a blind man, a complete illiterate, or to a person suffering from a loathsome disease. Yet that is the law to-day. I am informed that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has upon the calendar a bill to remedy this condition, and I believe its early passage highly desirable.

The annual report of the Commissioner General of Immigration for 1919 (pp. 386-387, reports of the Department of Labor, H. Doc. No. 422, 66th Cong., 2d sess.) says of the passport control system:

In the way above described there was established a system for the control of the travel of aliens more complete and more effective than any which had ever been put in operation by the United States Government. It made possible an at least fairly complete inquiry with regard to the character and antecedents of every alien who was seeking to come to this country, as well as the discovery, usually in most minute detail, of his purposes in coming. It was a most excellent arrangement for the purpose for which it was devised.

Incidentally, but nevertheless in very valuable and rather extensive ways, this visé-of-passports system placed upon immigration to the



United States a safeguard which, simply from the point of view of the adequate protection of the country against undesirable or undue immigration at a time when economic and other conditions were disturbed, was of most distinct value. Observing this, and having in mind also the experience of the bureau in the enforcement of the Chinese-exclusion laws, in connection with which officers specially trained in the enforcement of those laws were a number of years ago placed in the principal consulates in the Orient, the bureau has become satisfied that to a considerable extent the immigration laws would be valuably supplemented in times of peace if a system modeled on the one above described, with or without the use of passports, could be permanently adopted. The bureau does not mean by this that the enforcement of the immigration laws could by any means be transferred from the ports of this country to the places in foreign countries whence aliens come, or even to the seaports of foreign countries at which they embark when emigrating to the United States. There are certain difficulties, which seem to the bureau insuperable, in the way of so complete a change of practice. But if trained immigration officers were attached to American consulates, to act as advisers with respect to questions raised by prospective immigrants, and as advisers to the consular officials who visé passports, also to perform such other functions as may be required in any plan of immigration control that is evolved, it is believed that the results would be most beneficial. Aliens in every respect eligible and desirable would in this way be fully informed of the laws and regulations; but those inadmissible for any reason and even those likely to be rejected on arrival at United States ports would either be discouraged from coming or would at least be put upon notice and could then have no one to blame but themselves for the hardship that might result from their being rejected on arrival at this side.

The bureau is not advocating the permanent retention of the visé system as maintained during the war, but does strongly favor the continuance, as an immigration measure, of the principle involved, with or without the use of passports. It can be used not only as a means to aid in the regulation of immigration, but in gathering and giving information which will be beneficial in administering the immigration laws. Much of the misunderstanding arising in the enforcement of our laws results from lack of information of their requirements. The bureau is satisfied that there is in the system now in operation the germ of a new extension of the Immigration Service, whose officers, acting either under the State Department's officials abroad or in a separate capacity as representatives of this department, but always cooperating fully with the former, will furnish an element that will help to complete its machinery of administration.

Immigration is a world question, but for each nation it has a domestic application. In order that such application may be intelligently made, world wide information, not at intervals but constantly, has long been a necessity, and is now more so than ever before.

The Report of the Commissioner General for 1920, page 61, reiterates the statements of the previous year as quoted above, but urges that the visé system be modified so as to give a broader measure of authority to the officers of the United States abroad. This is recommended not only to meet the necessity to safeguard our country from the entrance of dangerous elements, but to save from the hardships of an ocean voyage inadmissible applicants who would find on arrival at our seaports that they must return to their former homes.

Expert testimony is not lacking that such an enlargement is essential for the well-being of the United States. Testifying before the Senate Immigration Committee on January 4 last, Commissioner Wallis of the Ellis Island Immigration Station declared that Europe was "literally moving to the United States" and that a flood of aliens was imminent.

The committee obviously was impressed with Commissioner Wallis's statements as to the need for inspection of aliens before leaving Europe and for more rigid examination after their arrival at American ports. The commissioner recommended particularly that facilities be established overseas for such inspections and declared that 90 per cent of the immigrants arriving under the existing system would be denied permission to sail if they were examined at the ports of embarkation by American officials. A proper system of examination in Europe and upon arrival, Mr. Wallis said, would prevent an imminent flood of those diseased in body and mind.

"Fortunately," he asserted, "the steamships of the world can bring only 1,300,000 a year to the United States. It is in the limited transportation facilities and increased examinations that we will get the best protection."

The Commissioner General of Immigration returned to the United States on January 15 after studying immigration problems in Europe.

"Secretary Wilson," he said, "has laid stress upon the necessity to adopt additional measures which will have a tendency to avoid long and expensive voyages on the part of intending emigrants who for some legal reason are refused admission on arrival at an American port."

"It is his idea that an effort should be made to discover at the outset of the journey if there are legal impediments, and if so the applicant should be so advised. This proposal would prevent the coming of persons disqualified from entry and materially aid in the enforcement of our immigration laws and regulations."

"I have been impressed with the apparently authentic reports concerning the great number of people in Europe who are awaiting or desire transportation to the United States and have been wondering what some localities there will do without them and what our country will do with them, in view of the reports of increasing unemployment here."

Testifying day before yesterday before the Senate Committee on Immigration the Commissioner General of Immigration stated that European Governments are strongly approving the policy of considering at the source the admissibility of an immigrant so as to avoid the tragedy of aliens who break up their homes in Europe and come to America only to be excluded. He referred to the very extensive preparations being made by steamship lines, foreign Governments, and public and private

organizations to handle the expected flood of immigrants bound for the United States. There is an abundance of testimony that the only effective way to stop undesirable immigration is to "get the jump on it" by going to the source. This, of course, is precisely what the passport control system accomplishes.

If the system is to be modified as here advocated, a larger sum than \$600,000 will be requisite. But as this matter is not yet determined, it appears to be the duty of the Committee on Appropriations to provide a sum based upon the present method of carrying on the work. It should not be presumed from the foregoing that I regard even the present inadequate passport control system as by any means worthless. I think it has been a great protection to the United States during the past two and one-half years. Two per cent of all applications for visé are now being refused. I believe that this percentage should be much larger. But even if this is maintained, it means that 14,000 thoroughly dangerous and inadmissible immigrants will be kept at home out of an expected immigration this year of nearly a million. Further, it is doubtless true that many undesirable are prevented even from applying because they know that they will be refused if they do apply. The indirect and psychological effect of the control system is probably quite as important as the direct one in keeping from our shores the dangerous element of eastern Europe.

But I do reiterate that the present law should be enlarged, as advocated by the Commissioner of Immigration, and that ample funds should be put at the disposal of the State Department which will enable it to investigate thoroughly every would-be immigrant so that he may be excluded if not a suitable element in our population. We should subject our immigrants to a double test. We should pass them through two sieves. We should "get the jump" on the intended immigrant by making sure before he even starts for the United States that he is likely to be worthy of admission. This is safer for the country and it is fairer for the immigrant.

We should also make available funds which would permit the State Department to run down passport and visé frauds which have recently become rampant in Europe. In spite of the efforts of the department, our visé stamps, fee stamps, official signatures, and official seals are being copied and counterfeited by organized gangs, who are working actively all over Europe to-day. Frauds are now being perpetrated on what appears to be a wholesale scale.

A recent examination of 35 persons with alleged American visés on their passports showed that 5 were fraudulent and counterfeit. One office in Europe reports from 5 to 20 fraudulent documents daily. The only way to cope with this condition is to appoint a corps of investigators to be attached to the several consulates of Europe for the detection of passport and visé frauds. The present staff engaged in passport-control work is inadequate for the proper examination into the frauds which are now prevalent. Everything possible is, however, being done and I think great credit should be paid to our consular officers for the initiative and success which they have shown in spite of the inadequate facilities at their disposal for the work.

### III. MERIT PROMOTIONS FOR OUR FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICERS.

The backbone of our Diplomatic Service is the secretary. A bad secretary may bring on a world war. An efficient secretary may enormously promote the welfare and prestige of the United States. Considering the importance and possibilities of the position, I believe that our secretaries are the most poorly paid men in the Government service. They enter the service at \$2,500 or less—after a preliminary training that usually involves six or eight years—and at the end of a lifetime of successful work in the foreign service they may hope to receive a salary of \$4,000 as first secretary. The burdens of maintaining adequately an important and dignified position in a foreign capital are financially very heavy. As a practical matter no man—certainly no married man—can expect to be able to make both ends meet on the Government salary. The result is that the men appointed almost invariably have, as they certainly need to have, private means. I believe that this result improperly limits to rich men applicants for positions as foreign secretary and is thoroughly undemocratic and indefensible. I believe that the United States can afford to pay a living wage for the service performed and one which is commensurate with the importance of the functions involved. I believe that this course is dictated both by common decency and self-interest.

To my mind it is extraordinary that the Diplomatic Service is as good as it is, considering the inadequacy of salary which pervades it. Doubtless it could be, and ought to be, much better; but to me it is extraordinary that it is not worse.

Congress has shown it is reluctant to increase diplomatic salaries. The only other incentive for the right kind of ambi-



tious young men to enter as fourth secretary, at the salary of \$2,500, is the prospect of promotion upon merit.

Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Taft very generously recognized the corps of secretaries by promoting its efficient members to the rank of minister as fast as vacancies arose. When Mr. Bryan became Secretary of State in 1913 there were 11 men in Latin America alone who had worked up to the rank of minister from subordinate places, either as consuls or as secretaries. They had won their places by sheer merit, recognized by Mr. Root and other great Secretaries of State. The secretarial service was gaining in effectiveness, and applications from excellent men were increasingly numerous. But it was not long before Mr. Bryan changed all this. Mr. Bryan looked upon the extremely delicate and important positions in Latin America as simply resting places for the lame, the halt, and the blind among deserving Democrats. Within the year after his assumption of the portfolio of the Department of State he had displaced all 11 of the Latin American ministers whom I have mentioned and who, as we have seen, had worked up to their places upon merit.

I do not wish to characterize too harshly the gentlemen who went forth in replacement of these experienced men. Some of them were pretty good; most of them were very, very bad. Not one of them had had the slightest diplomatic experience. It is safe to say that such a motley horde of alleged diplomats had never been sent forth at any time in the history of this or any other country. It is one of the saddest pages in American diplomatic history and has done incalculable harm, not only by throttling the ambitions of the service men who saw their chances of promotion stifled but by lowering the prestige of the Nation among its sister Republics of the Western Hemisphere.

Since Mr. Bryan went back to the political bourn from which no traveler returns I am glad to say that there has been a somewhat different atmosphere in the Department of State in the matter of diplomatic appointments on merit. Mr. Lansing or his successor promoted from the rank of secretary to the rank of minister Mr. Philip, now minister to Colombia; Mr. Grew, now minister to Denmark; Mr. Russell, now minister to the Dominican Republic; Mr. Phillips, now minister to the Netherlands; Mr. Gibson, now minister to Poland; Mr. Jay, minister to Salvador and later to Rumania; Mr. Dodge, minister to the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. I do not know what the politics of these men may be. I dare say that half of them are Republicans. All of them have been in the Diplomatic Service at least 13 years and some of them 25 or more years. I think it very greatly to the credit of Mr. Lansing that he had the courage to undo, so far as he could, the incalculable harm that Mr. Bryan had wrought. In addition to the service men whom I have enumerated I should mention Mr. Morgan, ambassador to Brazil since 1912, whom for some occult reason Mr. Bryan did not send to the guillotine and who is still at his post in Brazil, and also Mr. Bailey-Blanchard, who was sent as minister to Haiti by Mr. Bryan, after Mr. Bryan's first choice for that post had proved more than commonly inept.

I have noted with very great pleasure the announcement from Marion that Mr. Harding does not contemplate a return to the Bryanese methods of 1913 and 1914; but that, on the contrary, he hopes not merely to retain the merit ministers now in the service but to appoint competent secretaries to the rank of ministers as vacancies arise. I believe that no more permanently encouraging news could have been given to our foreign service and that the caliber of persons seeking appointments will be greatly improved as soon as it is found that the Diplomatic Service is not a "blind-alley" job.

I do not profess to say that all ambassadors and all ministers should be appointed from the ranks of secretaries or consuls. Nor do I suggest that all secretaries or consuls are fit to be made ambassadors or ministers. But I do assert that for every reason it is important that, in so far as practicable, competent secretaries and consuls should have the prospect before them of a promotion to the rank of minister as a reward for efficiency. The service itself, and the country with it, will be better off in consequence.

#### IV. PURCHASE OF EMBASSIES, LEGATIONS, AND CONSULATES.

At a time like the present, when obviously the Government should seek to reduce rather than increase expenses and to curtail governmental activities rather than to embark upon new ones, it may seem inexpedient to propose the expenditure of money for the purchase of embassy, legation, and consular buildings. Consideration of the subject in the light of existing conditions abroad and the present low rate of the European currencies, however, has convinced me that this Government would be shortsighted, indeed, were it to permit to pass an opportunity for obtaining at exceedingly low prices properties

which under normal conditions would be worth several times the amount paid for them. The fact that this Government is now expending for rent in the Diplomatic Service alone about \$150,000 annually, which represents 4 per cent upon a capital investment of \$3,750,000, tends to emphasize the practical importance of careful consideration of the question at the present time. To undertake at this time a program for the acquisition of suitable buildings for our foreign service is desirable both because of the importance of having our foreign representatives appropriately housed and because of what appears to me to be the wisdom of investing a modest amount of public money and credits in a uniquely profitable manner in the furtherance of our good relations and commerce with other nations.

The desirability of owning embassy, legation, and consular buildings abroad has been advocated for many years by statesmen, patriotic citizens, great commercial organizations, and business men. Congress itself has on a number of occasions made appropriations for the acquisition of buildings at certain capitals and commercial cities abroad, and in what is known as the Lowden Act, approved February 17, 1911, expressed its approval of the general principle of authorizing the Secretary of State to acquire buildings for the use of missions and consulates. Therefore it appears that there is general agreement upon the wisdom of acquiring buildings abroad, provided this can be accomplished without placing an undue burden upon the Public Treasury.

In many capitals this can be done with but a relatively small outlay in the present abnormal conditions, and will result in the acquisition for the Government of properties which a few years hence will be worth several times their present purchase price.

There is in one of the European capitals, for example, a building in good repair, eminently suited for a residence and office for the American ambassador, which is at present available. The building is well arranged, is admirably situated near the House of Parliament and within a few minutes' walk of the Japanese Embassy and the Swiss, Danish, and Norwegian Legations. This building was purchased by its present owners in 1882 for a price equaling \$750,000. Additions and repairs were afterwards made which brought the total cost up to, roughly, \$1,500,000. Owing to circumstances which require that the property be sold, there is now an unparalleled opportunity for the United States to purchase it. While the selling price in the foreign currency is only a little more than 16 per cent less than the total cost, the fact that the foreign currency is at present depreciated by approximately 94 per cent would enable the United States to purchase the property, valued in normal times at \$1,500,000, for the sum of about \$75,000. The amount now paid for the offices of the American commission in the city in which the property described is situated is \$4,000, which would be saved through the action suggested, thus insuring at once a 5 per cent return upon the amount expended for the purchase of the property. Delay in purchasing this property will unquestionably be followed by its sale to private individuals who are now negotiating for it.

The property described is in Berlin; but similar opportunities for the advantageous acquisition of embassy, legation, or consular buildings exist in many places. Not only are properties to be had at most favorable prices in the currencies of the foreign countries, but the depreciation of those currencies in the money of the United States, as shown by the following table of the current rate of exchange, is such that for a relatively small outlay in American money sufficient foreign currency can be made available with which to purchase properties at extraordinarily advantageous rates.

Country.	Exchange at par.	Exchange rate Jan. 13, 1920.	Per cent of depreciation.
France.....	19.3	6.12½	68.3
Italy.....	19.3	3.48	82.0
Belgium.....	19.3	6.45	66.6
Germany.....	23.8	1.46	93.9
Austria.....	20.3	.21	98.98
Czechoslovakia.....	20.3	1.19	94.2
Greece.....	19.3	7.53	61.0
Rumania.....	19.3	1.35	93.1
Serbia.....	19.3	2.74	96.6

\* There is still another favorable factor in the present situation which would doubtless prove advantageous alike to the United States and the interested foreign countries if a number of embassy and legation buildings could be purchased at this time. The United States holds obligations of other Governments based upon loans and other arrangements made during



the war amounting to about \$10,000,000,000. It is quite probable, were the Congress to authorize the application of a small amount of these credits in payment in whole or in part of the purchase price of properties which could be acquired through the debtor Governments, that several desirable properties could be purchased with advantage to the United States and satisfaction to the foreign Governments concerned. Moreover, it is in the interest of the commercial relations of the United States with the nations whose currency has suffered so great a depreciation in United States money to utilize every convenient opportunity to improve exchange conditions through purchases made in those countries, and therefore the procedure which I am suggesting would be beneficial to commerce in improving exchange, as well as to the Government through the acquisition of properties greatly to be desired.

In relation to this subject it is interesting to note that some of the most valuable embassy and legation buildings now possessed by Great Britain in European capitals were acquired by taking advantage of the conditions prevailing at the conclusion of the Napoleonic wars. Some of those properties are worth to-day many times the price paid for them, notably that in Paris, valued in 1914 at more than \$1,500,000, but which cost only a small part of that sum. As of further interest it should be said that the legislative body of Brazil in October, 1920, authorized that Government to expend 1,000 contos—\$650,000 United States gold—each fiscal year in acquiring embassy and legation buildings, and I am informed that the proposed purchases are to be made in countries with which exchange is favorable to Brazil.

The European countries to which we have made cash advances since 1917 include Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, Great Britain, Greece, Italy, Rumania, and Serbia. The smallest sum owed us by any of these countries is \$25,000,000. I believe that all would be willing to exchange a portion of their debt to the United States for a building suitable for our embassy or legation. The countries concerned would rightly feel that this course was a fair one from the standpoint of their relationship to the United States; they would also welcome the opportunity to have the American representatives in their respective capitals permanently and suitably housed. On the other hand and from the viewpoint of the United States, the arrangement would permit us promptly to acquire properties which we unquestionably can utilize to great advantage, the cost thereof to be paid for from assets which for a time, at least, are to be regarded as of uncertain value.

I shall not enter upon any argument in favor of the general policy of acquisition of foreign-service buildings in the principal countries of the world. I shall pause only to say that in my judgment no step could be taken which would more directly improve the quality of our foreign representation. We should have suitable and dignified quarters for our ambassadors and ministers, but never extravagant or palatial ones. If this program were strictly adhered to, a rich man would be pulled down to the proper and unostentatious average, while the poor man would find himself relieved from the present intolerable burden—often equal to his entire salary or more—of renting even reasonably suitable quarters in which he may reside. Just as I favor higher salaries for the Diplomatic Service because of the inherent democracy of so doing, so here I favor a policy of providing appropriate residences for our representatives. The program means a chance for the able diplomat who has not the money to take a post because of the exactions which he must at present meet. It is not conducive to national pride to notice that the United States has lagged far behind the other principal countries of the world in acquiring residences for its ministers abroad.

There is one matter in connection with this subject which requires special treatment. On May 24, 1919, Mr. J. P. Morgan offered as an unconditional gift to the American Government his residence in London, a freehold. The house faces Hyde Park and is within a few hundred yards of the present embassy offices of the United States. It is described by Ambassador Davis and others as entirely suitable for an embassy. On April 17, 1920, Mr. Morgan wrote a further letter to the Secretary of State asking for an answer to his offer at the earliest convenient moment. On December 31 last he advised the State Department that it would be necessary for him to know by March 4 next whether his offer is accepted or declined, and that he shall feel compelled to withdraw the offer on the latter date if we do not previously accept it.

Acting Secretary Davis, in transmitting Mr. Morgan's latest letter, suggested the great advantage which would accrue to the United States from owning its own embassy building in London. Mr. Davis states that the house is well located and

will afford a very satisfactory residence for the American ambassador for many years, and expresses the earnest hope that Congress may be disposed to accept Mr. Morgan's generous gift of this suitable residence for its representative in London.

Manifestly congressional action is a prerequisite to acceptance of the gift. Less than six weeks remain before the offer will be withdrawn. To my mind it would be exceedingly shortsighted for the Congress to allow this opportunity to lapse.

The only objection which can be advanced to the acceptance of such a gift arises from the possible feeling that the United States should not accept gifts from private individuals. But the United States has not hesitated to accept gifts of embassies and consulates from foreign nations, and if it can properly do this it would certainly seem free from objection for us to accept a gift from one of our own citizens.

The legation property in Bangkok was presented to us in 1884 by the King of Siam, and its exchange for other property owned by the Siamese Government was only recently authorized by Congress.

The consular property in Tahiti was a gift from the reigning queen.

The new legation in Salvador is erected upon land presented by that Government and accepted by the President under the authority of the act of Congress approved April 15, 1918.

Instances where Congress has authorized the acceptance of gifts from individual citizens are very numerous. Some of them are here enumerated.

Sites for manufacture of armor. (Act Aug. 29, 1916; 39 Stat., 563.)

Aviation sites. (Act Aug. 29, 1916, 39 Stat., 622; June 15, 1917, 40 Stat., 182; July 27, 1917, 40 Stat., 247.)

Mobilization sites. (Act Aug. 29, 1916, 39 Stat., 623.)

Nitrate-plant sites. (Act June 3, 1916; 39 Stat., 215.)

Gifts to Navy. (Act May 20, 1908, 35 Stat., 171.)

Horses for breeding purposes. (41 Stat., 962.)

Expenses of land for fish hatchery to be given by individual named in the act. (39 Stat., 431.)

Buildings in the District of Columbia for housing purposes. (40 Stat., 550.)

Gifts for rifle ranges. (36 Stat., 1457.)

Land to be given by Memorial Association of Georgia. (39 Stat., 901.)

One hundred and twenty-five acres, premises at Guilford Court House. (39 Stat., 997.)

Authorization to receive gifts of land. (36 Stat., 964.)

Gift from Lincoln Farm Association of birthplace of Lincoln and \$60,000 for its maintenance. (39 Stat., 385.)

Land for cemetery purposes. (36 Stat., 1077.)

Constitution Island. (35 Stat., 1166.)

Land near Fort Missoula. (33 Stat., 142.)

Of course, as we all know, this very Capitol Building is filled with decorations and articles which have been presented to the United States by individual citizens. How can even the most strained viewpoint find a tinge of impropriety in the practice?

Many other precedents could be cited, but these will suffice to show that it has been the frequent policy of the Congress to authorize in principle such a gift as that now pending.

#### V. REORGANIZATION OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE.

The State Department is and must inevitably be the medium of communication, both political and commercial, between the United States and the other countries of the world. At one time political questions and commercial questions were largely in separate, water-tight compartments; or, at all events, they did not closely or vitally interrelate. But to-day there is scarcely a political question arising in our foreign intercourse which is not also commercial, and there is scarcely a commercial question which is not also political. It therefore becomes far more important than in the past that one agency of the Government shall exercise direct supervision and control of the whole problem of foreign intercourse. As I say, it seems to me inevitable that this agency shall be the Department of State. But the Department of State is apparently not very popular with the commercial concerns and organizations of the United States. This feeling has been responsible for the highly unscientific and duplicative entry of the Department of Commerce into the foreign field. There is no place for two departments in the one realm. Congress should require one or the other to withdraw. I repeat, that in my opinion the one that should be left is the Department of State. A large portion of the unpopularity of the State Department arises from causes within itself which I believe capable of removal. In other words, the department must deliberately go to work, with the assistance of Congress, to acquire the confidence of the American business world.



A wholesale reorganization at the seat of government is essential and was projected by Mr. Lansing at the moment when his mind began to fail to go along with the President's.

A far more important and difficult reorganization of the State Department's personnel and functions must be undertaken in connection with the field forces. At present the diplomatic side of the foreign service is almost completely divorced from the consular side, with such contact as there is achieved only by way of Washington. In former days this condition was not so manifestly unsound. The diplomatic side could then deal fairly effectively with affairs political in character while the consular side was dealing with affairs commercial in character. But, as I have hitherto observed, almost every question to-day partakes both of a political and a commercial character. The divorce of the two sides of the service abroad is fatal. It is fatal to the skillful adjustment of the question at issue, and it is fatal to the proper elasticity of the personnel in the field. Many a man who is a failure as a diplomat might make a good consul, and vice versa. The Department of State should have the right to assign a consul to diplomatic duties and a diplomat to consular duties. For one thing, this would remove the intolerable social barrier which some ill-advised persons seek to erect between the two sides of the single service. Furthermore, it would make a given individual more expert and experienced in the problems daily arising if he had had experience both in diplomatic and in consular offices.

If there ever was a reason for the separation, it is gone to-day. The solution is to create a single foreign service and a single corps of foreign-service officers, suitably graded so that the State Department can at any moment assign any member of the corps to the position and to the work for which he is best adapted. The change may not seem very considerable, but in my judgment it goes to the essence. It follows in the pathway recently traveled by our principal political and commercial rivals. Many other changes in detail might well be indicated, but I prefer to mention what I believe to be the single essential modification. The United States is in earnest and forever a great world power. Perhaps it is not too much to say that to-day she is the great world power. Our foreign service has not received the frequent and the detailed examination of the Congress or the United States. To my mind it is remarkable that it is as effective an organization as I believe it to be. But if the United States is to play skillfully its part in the work of the world, the State Department and its ramifications must be upheld and encouraged to grow along right lines. No greater service to the country can be performed by Congress than to build scientifically upon the foundations which now exist. The next world war will be an economic war. The struggle has already begun and will be the keenest known to history. The foreign service of the United States must be the first line both of offense and defense. Congress owes the United States a paramount duty to provide the necessary weapons and equipment.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The purchase of embassies is a very important matter. The one which the gentleman says could be purchased for \$75,000 I know cost the people who want to sell it \$1,200,000. I saw it myself.

Mr. ROGERS. The Committee of the Whole has no authority to extend the time, and therefore I can not ask for an extension of time.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Let it go over. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important subject, and if there are but 40 or 45 Members on the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Currie, Mich.	Gandy	Johnson, Wash.
Babka	Curry, Calif.	Glynn	Johnston, N. Y.
Baer	Dale	Goldfogle	Kelley, Mich.
Barkley	Davis, Minn.	Good	Kennedy, Iowa
Bee	Davis, Tenn.	Goodall	Kennedy, R. I.
Begg	Dent	Goodwin, Ark.	Kettner
Bell	Dewalt	Gould	Kincheloe
Benson	Donovan	Graham, Pa.	Kinkaid
Blackmon	Doofing	Greene, Mass.	Kitchin
Bland, Mo.	Doremus	Griest	Klecza
Brooks, Pa.	Drewry	Hamill	Kreider
Brumbaugh	Dupré	Harrison	Langley
Burroughs	Eagle	Haugen	Leshner
Butler	Echols	Hill	Little
Caldwell	Edmonds	Hoey	Loneragan
Cantrill	Emerson	Holland	McAndrews
Carew	Evans, Nev.	Hullings	McCulloch
Casey	Ferris	Hull, Iowa	McDuffie
Cleary	Focht	James, Mich.	McFadden
Copley	Frear	James, Va.	McGlennon
Costello	Gallagher	Jeffers	McKenzie
Cullen	Gallivan	Johnson, Ky.	McKeown

McKiniry	Nolan	Sanford	Tague
McKinley	O'Connell	Schall	Taylor, Ark.
McLane	Olney	Scott	Taylor, Colo.
MacGregor	Overstreet	Scully	Tillman
Maier	Perlman	Sells	Tinkham
Major	Pou	Siegel	Upshaw
Mann, S. C.	Rainey, Ala.	Sims	Vare
Mead	Rainey, Henry T.	Smith, Ill.	Voigt
Milligan	Rainey, John W.	Smith, Mich.	Volk
Montague	Reed, W. Va.	Smith, N. Y.	Ward
Moon	Riordan	Smithwick	Watson
Mooney	Robinson, N. C.	Snell	Weaver
Moore, Va.	Romjue	Snyder	Welty
Morin	Rowan	Steenerson	Winslow
Mudd	Rowe	Stephens, Miss.	Wise
Neely	Rubey	Stiness	Wood, Ind.
Nelson, Wis.	Rucker	Sullivan	Wright
Newton, Mo.	Sabath	Summers, Wash.	Young, Tex.
Nicholls	Sanders, Ind.	Swope	

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill H. R. 15872, found itself without a quorum, that he directed the roll to be called and that 266 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and he handed in a list of the absentees.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VENABLE].

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, on the 4th of March next I retire from public service.

It was my fortune to enter this House prior to our entry into the World War, and for five years it has been my privilege to serve during a period, revolutionary in character, not only in our own country but also in the entire world.

It happened that my first speech here was in advocacy of adequate preparation for the war that seemed to me to be impending in all possibility. I should like for my last to be a tribute, feeble though it be, to an apostle of peace.

The administration of Woodrow Wilson and his party is drawing rapidly to a close. The personality of the man is so closely interwoven in the warp and woof of its accomplishments that it is impossible to separate them, as much so as to separate the administration of Lincoln from Lincoln himself.

He has been praised, blamed, abused, extolled, criticized. In short, he has suffered the fate of almost all men called upon to lead in time of a national crisis. It is the irony of fate that such should be the case, but he who strives for great objectives must needs conflict with some whose plans are different, or who are called upon to sacrifice a private advantage for the public good and are without the vision to see the need or the requisite patriotism to bear it patiently.

This he must bear. History will write her judgment and time will render her verdict. When men are far enough removed to gain a proper perspective, to see his work in its true proportions, impartial history will do him justice.

I remember how these halls have resounded with his praises, how men have rejoiced to call him leader, and men of both parties have asked to be returned to the Congress on the ground that they were upholding his hands in the work he was trying to do. I remember also, at a later day, the attacks upon his motives, his purpose, his wisdom. How the natural reaction from a prolonged period of stress and the discontent with the hardships incident to an expensive war were turned into well-nigh personal attacks upon him, and that, too, at a time when, shattered in health in the service of the country, one would expect from everyone a touch of human sympathy.

Oh, well, Mr. Chairman, such is the fate of leadership in national crises, shared with him by Washington and Lincoln, both of whom are now canonized in the affections of the Republic, while critic and criticism are alike forgot. They pass, like Arthur of the legend, "The King is dead, God save the King," cries the thoughtless crowd, thinking less of the funeral than of the coming coronation, measuring history with the coins of the interests, passions, and prejudices of the moment.

Though unfitted for the task, I am not content that this Congress should close without a tribute being paid, though a feeble one, to the services of Woodrow Wilson.

Mr. Chairman, I can not think of creation without a Creator, and when I think of the matchless order of the universe, seeing how the forces of nature with noiseless might work her miracles, and watch the twinkling stars, each a mighty sun, around which wheel in marshaled order an attendant train of worlds, I must needs believe that the Mind which first conceived and then produced them must needs be a mind of order. I can not conceive a mind of order without a mind of plan. Surely the God who made the stars did not toss them from His hand in idle play! He did not create the world and man and then forget them. Surely there is a Divine plan in history!

The God of history has written a page in the drama of the race. We read but can not fully comprehend. In the years to come, with other pages added, men will read and perceive how this bloody and war-torn time fitted into the even then incomplete whole; how these tragic happenings were the causes from which flowed gigantic effects. Yea, even from its follies of death and slaughter and appeals to force, draw lessons for the guidance of men.

Wilson is placed in the great mosaic. Does he contribute to or mar the pattern? I know of no test other than to measure his work by the spirit of those ethical standards that men believe have their origin in the breast of Deity himself.

Rarely, if ever, has there been in the history of government a leader who so emphasized the importance of solving governmental problems, domestic or foreign, by the standard of ethical soundness. No man so manifested a fundamental belief that a question must be solved according to sound ethical principles in order to have settlement at all. He who heard, or now reads, his messages and addresses must be conscious of the inevitable ethical appeal.

Yea, more than this. There is manifest a religious conviction that through men there is being worked out a great Divine plan; that ethical principles are the charts of action to forward it; and that men and nations are working in accord with divinity to the extent that they are observed. In his address to the Confederate veterans in their reunion in Washington on June 5, 1917, he said:

Many men, I know, particularly of your own generation, have wondered at some of the dealings of Providence, but the wise heart never questions the dealings of Providence, because the great, long plan, as it unfolds, has a majesty about it and a definiteness of purpose, an elevation of ideal, which we are incapable of conceiving as we tried to work things out with our own short sight and weak strength. And now we see ourselves part of a Nation united, powerful, great in spirit and in purpose; we know the great ends that God, in His mysterious providence, wrought through our instrumentality, because at the heart of the men of the North and of the South there was the same love of self-government and of liberty, and now we are to be an instrument in the hands of God to see that liberty is made secure for mankind. \* \* \*

Mr. Chairman, ethics is inconceivable apart from mankind. Being the rules for the conduct of human beings toward one another, its inevitable logic is to throw the emphasis upon the sanctity of individualism, and so Wilson emerges the great democrat in spirit. Government, as such, has no rights. The individual only has rights, and government exists only as the instrumentality by which the exercise of the rights may be effective. Its forms, limitations, and processes are but means. The result is the thing, and the test is whether given action promotes human happiness and the opportunity of the individual to expand the present limitations of existing conditions.

At a citizenship convention in Washington on July 13, 1916, he said:

When you ask a man to be loyal to a government, if he comes from some foreign country, his idea is that he is expected to be loyal to a certain set of persons like a ruler or a body set in authority over him, but that is not the American idea. Our idea is that he is to be loyal to certain objects in life, and that the only reason he has a President, and a Congress, and a governor, and a State legislature, and courts is that the community shall have instrumentalities by which to promote those objects.

The same ethical viewpoint is manifested in his addresses when occasion offered the question of labor. He insisted that labor legislation and the solution of labor problems must be looked at from the viewpoint that labor was a part of a man's life and not a mere marketable commodity, and hence, was imposed the duty on the part of those dealing with it to see to it that this principle should be observed in legislation, but also that the price of labor as determined by the mere law of supply and demand should not be taken as the criterion. The duty to mankind and social justice should also be taken into consideration.

In his speech of acceptance of September 2, 1916, he says that we must hearten labor by doing justice to the laborer; not only by paying a living wage, but by making the conditions which surround labor all that they ought to be; that we must do more than justice. We must safeguard life and promote health and safety in every occupation. He said that this was more than justice, and better, because it was humanity.

With his conception of the spirit of democracy it was not enough that government should be of the people. It must also be by the people and for the people; its object always the betterment of the lives of individuals. He, therefore, sought to be the interpreter of national will. He wanted to know what people were wanting. As President, he conceived himself, by virtue of his constitutional duty to recommend to the Congress, the appointed agent to express in concrete proposals the desire of the individuals who make up the Nation, and not simply the personal recommendations of himself as a trustee for their

welfare. The people were to be a constant governing force, he a constant interpreter of their will as it formed from time to time, even though under our constitutional form his Executive powers were conferred for a stated time and could not be withdrawn at will by the people from whom he received his commission.

I do not mean by this the current, hastily formed opinion of the moment, but what he deemed to be the settled, well formed, intelligent will of the Nation.

Thinking of government in terms of men, desiring the progress and happiness of individuals and not the glory of organization or government, he said that he had a passion for freedom.

Viewing problems of government from the viewpoint of ethics, which is as broad as mankind, he could not conceive of a national destiny for America other than that of bringing the blessings of happiness and liberty and rightfulness to peoples of other lands in all legitimate ways. America was to be the exemplar in government of the promotion of happiness, liberty, and human rights to all the world.

Mr. Chairman, through the years there had grown up in the Central Empires in the ruling military caste a rationalistic philosophy of life and government whose logic was war and whose destiny was either world domination or its own destruction. In a few words, it was argued that the law of life was a law of the survival of the fittest; that the stronger creature maintained itself by the destruction of the weaker; that man was a creature, and that, therefore, man was subject to this law. That nations were simply aggregations of men, and hence the law applied to governments, and therefore it was argued that it was but according to a natural law that one nation should grow strong by the destruction of another and a weaker one; and that this was nature's way of eliminating the weaker elements, leaving the stronger to become the progenitors of a yet stronger race. That since government was the organization through which this racial betterment and the uplift of man was and must be effectuated, the government was of more importance than the individual, and he was important only as a unit in the whole. It was argued that this was nature's way of uplifting mankind, and it is apparent that according to the logic of this philosophy the duty to nature would not be completely performed until all weaker peoples had been conquered by the strongest. They taught that war was a biological necessity, and that it was not only the right but the duty to crush weaker folk, and according to the philosophy the fact that they could be crushed was conclusive that they should be.

Von Bernhardt says:

The law of the strong holds good everywhere. Might is the supreme right and the dispute as to what is right is decided by the arbitrament of war. War gives a biologically just decision.

Reimer in his work states that:

Let it not be said that every people has a right to its existence. \* \* \* By making play with this principle one may put on a cheap appearance of civilization, but only so long as the people in question \* \* \* does not stand in the way of a more powerful people.

Prof. von Seyden, in the Frankfurter Zeitung, declared:

The Germans are the elect people of the earth. They will accomplish their destiny, which is to govern the world and direct other nations for the welfare of humanity.

I might multiply quotations to show that my statement of the case is correct, but I must hasten.

As a result of this philosophy, or as a result of motives for which the philosophy was invented and taught as a justification and excuse, the world was plunged into war.

At first it appeared to us and other nations that it was but the contest of nations similar to wars of the past, in which we could have no concern. The philosophy behind the acts of aggression had not been apprehended or comprehended. It was thought a war for national trade, territory, and advantage; yes. But its deeper significance had not appeared.

Statesmen and diplomats were talking of territory to be gained, national advantage or disadvantage; were thinking of future combinations of balanced forces and moving the pawns about in the game of pelf.

The history of the time is known to us. How to the threat of her philosophy were added the overt acts of intolerable aggression, the cold adoption and declaration of a purpose to practically blockade our ports through circumscribing a certain area of the ocean, and the killing of our citizens in the exercise of their undoubted rights.

The logic of the philosophy was the subjugation of the world; it was a standing threat against all free peoples and hampered all such in the enjoyment of freedom from fear of attack and relaxation from military systems essential to defense, so essential to the full and free enjoyment of democratic government.



To Mr. Wilson more than any other man is due the credit of directing attention to the primary meaning of the struggle, of lifting it out of the ruck of pride and pelf and giving to the war the character of a crusade to rescue the Holy Grail of the right of men, freed from the menace of attack, to enjoy the blessings of democratic development. So we fought to make the world safe for democracy and the freedom of mankind. His pen preached the sermons of freedom and the rights of the individual, in contradistinction to the government worship of the Central Empires—not only to our own people and those of our Allies but also to the individual German citizen himself. His pen was mighty.

No man can estimate the effect his words had toward making the German citizen question the wisdom of his rulers, contributing toward that final withdrawal of support and loss of morale, or rather gain of morals, which resulted in the collapse of the German war machine through the withdrawal of support at home. Measuring the value of his pen, Mr. Chairman, in terms of cannon and of men, I believe that the future historian will compute it in large amount.

In his messages addressed during the war, both to his fellow citizens and the world, we find the same ethical appeal of which I have spoken, the same love of human welfare, the same sanctity of individualism, the same appeal to right for right's sake. He filled the world with the Crusader's spirit; he quickened the pulse of democracy the world over; he cast upon the gray wall of the clouds that hovered over the world the glowing picture of the ideal toward which men struggled through the mud and blood and stench of battle, or, inspired by which, they bore at home without complaining the necessary sacrifices of the war.

He dreamed dreams and saw visions. Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is true; but he was not simply a dreamer of dreams. He sought to make his dreams realities.

His first administration was great in its achievements in the field of domestic reform and legislation. For years the country had asked for reform of its financial system. The evils were apparent, and had been for many years, but the party in power lacked either the power or the will to do the work. The Wilson administration did it, and there came into being the Federal Reserve System, which has so well fulfilled its mission, when under the old banking system it is universally admitted that the financing of the war and the safeguarding of the country from panic and disaster would have been impossible. Surely a kindly Providence ruled our destinies.

The farm loan act for the first time furnished the farming business of the country adequate financial machinery and governmental justice. Mr. Chairman, I have not the time to dwell upon the many laws of a constructive character that have been enacted since Mr. Wilson has been President. Be it said that it is a most remarkable record, and even the political enemies of the party that passed them pay the compliment of not proposing to change them in any vital particular.

The energy with which he and his administration attacked the practical problems of the war is a story known to you as fully as to me. I mention these matters, Mr. Chairman, with the purpose of showing that a dreamer of dreams may be a doer of deeds, and in the mention of Mr. Wilson I do not wish to seem to discount the work and talent of those devoted men in the Congress and executive departments of the Government whose joint product with him the legislation was. But when this is said, it still remains true that to a large extent his spirit was the inspiration, his courage was the staying force, his will to work for the betterment of the people was the dynamics from which flowed the possibility of accomplishment.

Mr. Chairman, it was inevitable that the suffering and struggle of the World War, the agony of flesh and spirit to which humanity was subjected, the world-wide ruin that was wrought, and the contemplation of the financial burdens under which humanity must struggle for many generations forced the race to ask the question why such things should be.

Such was the condition of circumstances that the entire world, practically considered, laid aside for the arbitrament of its disputes all appeals to reason, right, justice, or the dictates of humanity and frankly appealed to physical force. The world went to war, with the results of war attendant. Millions died, millions were maimed, millions starved, millions rotted with diseases. Millions of square miles of fair country, city, hamlet, and countryside were laid in waste, and the world emerged from the awful struggle with the right victorious but bleeding at every pore. The agony of it forced the question why such things should be, and during the agony of the struggle the soldier in the trench, surrounded with the rotting fragments of a shell-blasted comrade, or crawling over shell-torn earth to come

to bayonet grips with his enemy, or cowering in his dugout while earth and air were torn with the giant blasting of exploding bombs, vowed that when the war was over that some expedient should be adopted to render a recurrence impossible. "Never again" was the cry of his heart, and he fondly hoped that he was fighting that wars might be no more. There was then the universal determination that after the awakening from the nightmare humanity in its sanity would constitute a society of nations whose concert and concord would be of such a character that like conflicts would be impossible.

There was driven home to the consciousness of mankind a realization of the fact that such a thing as national isolation had become an impossibility, and that such was the complexity of modern international life that a war between any two of the great nations of the world would almost inevitably draw all nations into its vortex.

Old diplomacy had failed, old alliances with balances of power had been demonstrated to be rather the fruitful causes than the preventives of war. Old standards had failed, old methods had been shown useless. Old causes were still in existence and would, if permitted to operate in the future, produce like results of world danger and death. There must be a new viewpoint, a new accord. There must be new methods. For war as an ultimate arbiter of international disputes there must be substituted a method of peace. For force—in its final analysis, an appeal to the law of the jungle, the standard of the brute—there must be substituted a method having embodied in it those qualities of mind, conscience, justice, and right, the possession of which distinguishes man from the brute creation. The laws of settlement must be the rules of ethics, and not the law of force.

Oh, Mr. Chairman, what a wonderful dream was this! What a task for statesmen, what a challenge to the brain and heart of the world! The creation of a world peace, the substitution of right for force, of love for hate, of trust for suspicion.

The elements of the problem were clear. War as a method for the settlement of international disputes had been recognized as legitimate by international law and the custom of nations. Such being the case, the setting of this method aside could only be accomplished by mutual agreement. If such agreement was made, some method of settlement had to be substituted for it. This had to be, from the object to be attained, a method of peace where the rules of decision would be such standards as were considered right and just, and from its nature some sort of tribunal in which all nations had some common interest and representation, and lest some nation sometime recalcitrant might attempt in a moment of temptation to return to the old standards there had to be sufficient force somewhere to supply the compulsion to peace which would then be necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to discuss the covenant of the League of Nations, however much I believe in it. I have another purpose. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Wilson felt the same impulse as the rest of mankind; he dreamed the same dreams; he interpreted the then almost universal desire. He dedicated his life in this service to humanity. With all the force of his character he set about the work of making the dream come true. To him more than any other man is due the credit of the coming into being of the League of Nations, in which nearly all the nations are now members. His faith, his courage, his implacable purpose, his constant appeals to the heart and moral sense of mankind helped to overcome fears, the fears of the untried to which all men are more or less subject, and in the presence of which timid spirits shrink and cower.

The League of Nations was born and now lives. Needing development in some particulars, it may be; destined to modify with the years, perhaps, but containing those elements which I have outlined which any plan must have if wars are to be eliminated as a method for the settlement of international disputes.

Oh, Mr. Chairman, I have heard men say that Mr. Wilson failed because America has up to this time failed to enter this concert of nations. Has he failed; or, rather, have not we failed? Does our failure to follow condemn the leader?

I know not whether the League of Nations can survive if we definitely and permanently refuse to enter. This, only time can tell. I know not what the course of this country will be. But this I do know: Under the guidance and inspiration of the ideal of human right and happiness, the overwhelming sentiment of the peoples of Europe demanded of the most chauvinistic of their statesmen, who wished to rely on the guarantees furnished by force, that they follow American leadership. It never occurred to them that America would desert them in their hour of need. They were willing to try the great experiment. They saw the need of some machinery of international character not only as a guaranty of peace, but also as furnishing the means



for international concord of practical character for the starting again of the wheels of civilization and peaceful pursuits in war-torn Europe. The league was to furnish the guaranties which otherwise must be relied upon from force and military might and occupation.

Their faith was shattered. America refused participation in the task. Sense of security was gone. Fears returned. The chauvinist has his day, and through these very fears Europe is suffering a reaction and in desperation turning to old methods, or is inclined to. Are we to have again, through our failure, the old system of military alliances, strategic frontiers, balances of power, and press of fear that produce wars and have given "men of blood and iron a chance to show their teeth"?

Ah, Mr. Chairman, the reactionary militaristic movement in Europe which began after America showed her intention to abandon any participation in the league already shows itself. Belgium and France have signed a treaty by which Belgium is to maintain an army of 500,000 men as compared to 100,000 before the war. In September there was made what is practically an alliance between France and Italy by which Fiume and all the Dalmatian coast will pass quietly to Italy, thus cutting off the Jugo-Slavs from all access to the sea and so sowing the dragon's teeth of another war. In return, Italy is not to protest again at a French invasion of Frankfort.

There has arisen in France a certain sentiment which demands that France must have as guaranty against future invasion by Germany the land up to the Rhine. Another Alsace-Lorraine, another cause for revenge, another terra irridentia.

Europe is prostrate, racked by fear, bankrupt, and broken; unable to start the wheels of industry; unable to buy raw materials. Hopeless without America, she turns as she thinks, perforce, to her only remedy and protection, to the old order of alliance and militarism. Unable to buy from us owing to inability, unassisted, to start the wheels of industry, we ourselves suffer. Prices tumble, markets fail, and our own land is filled with discontent.

Heart of pity! Have we by our refusal to enter the league contributed to this chaos, turned the eyes of humanity for guidance from the teachings of the Prince of Peace to the slaving jaws of the wolf pack? Are we setting the stage for another horrible war, with its millions dead, its load of debt, its agony of heart and spirit? If we have, God pity us. Our guilt is the guilt of blood. [Applause.]

It has been said that during his administration we have had a one-man Government, and I have heard this charge of self-stultification brought by Members of this and our companion body. I hasten to defend this House, and in fact the entire National Legislature. It were sad, indeed, if national legislators deliberately converted themselves into rubber stamps and renounced the exercise of that judgment which as coordinate members of the Government they were under the duty to exercise in the representation of their constituencies. This is a grave charge that has been brought. Its implication is that the legislative department has been paralyzed by some sinister or hurtful power exercised by Mr. Wilson, and that he has taken to himself somewhat of the functions of a dictator in the policies that have been pursued during the past few years. I deny this. That he has exercised a predominant influence upon the affairs of the country I admit, and that the Congress has been responsive to his suggestions also is true. But it has been true not because of sinister power, because Congress is not under the jurisdiction of the Executive but is coordinate with it and has within its realm the sovereign power to act as it sees fit. Mr. Wilson has been followed by gentlemen of both parties, because they felt that he had correctly interpreted the will of the people whom they represented in the recommendations which he made from time to time to the National Legislature. This House has not acted through fear of Wilson. It has not followed his suggestions because they were coerced against their will. They have followed because they were convinced that when he spoke he spoke the will of the citizenship of the country, or because they were convinced that the recommendation was dictated by wisdom. When they did not so believe they have not hesitated to vote contrary to the recommendation made, as is amply proven by the records of the Congress.

Aside from the inherent force of great intellect, clear vision, and definite purpose, his power lay in perceiving the will of the people and expressing it with force and vigor.

I defend Mr. Wilson and House and Senate in saying that if there was fear in House or Senate, it was not the fear of Mr. Wilson but the fear of failing to express the will of the people, which they believed was contained in his recommendations.

War is in its very nature executive in character and to wage it successfully there must be concentration of power and re-

sponsibility in the executive head of the Government. The Congress wisely recognized this fact and conferred the powers on Mr. Wilson. His was the task, his was the responsibility, his the praise or his the blame. Is it just, then, after success, to condemn him for the exercise of those powers we ourselves conferred and which made success possible?

The charge has been made that he was stubborn and had not enough of the spirit of compromise.

Mr. Chairman, the same charge is always made against men of strength who strive for great objectives and battle toward their accomplishment. I think, Mr. Chairman, that history will say that it was fortunate that Mr. Wilson was a man of implacable purpose. Such are needed in time of war, especially of the character of the latter.

How would the country have fared had we had a weakling in the White House? What would have been our condition if in the great crises of necessarily rapid decision there had been vacillation?

On several occasions, Mr. Chairman, in this very House, when a great war decision had to be made and the Nation had to walk dim paths and was forced to choose Members have differed and differences have waxed warm. Decision was necessary, delay was costly, concert of action was essential to national safety. Mr. Wilson, by firm recommendation of a given course, by shouldering responsibility for decision, by an expression of confidence in a given way has closed divided ranks and brought concert where otherwise there would have been division and delay.

But they say, Mr. Chairman, that he was stubborn in his effort to have the covenant of the League of Nations ratified in the Senate. Does the record sustain this charge? The first objection urged by its opponents had to do with the Monroe doctrine and the jurisdiction of domestic questions. While believing that the objections were unsound, Mr. Wilson had the covenant amended to meet them. Other reservations were urged, and, with the consent of Mr. Wilson, Senator HITCHCOCK introduced reservations covering the objections, and they were voted down by the men urging their absence as a defect.

Can it be called stubbornness on the part of Mr. Wilson because he objected to reservations which he believed would destroy the efficacy of the covenant for the purpose it was designed to effect? If he was stubborn, what of the two-thirds of the Senate who were for the league with reservations but could not agree among themselves as to the reservations they wanted and hence failed to ratify the covenant in any form?

Ah, Mr. Chairman, it has even been said that the covenant failed of ratification because Mr. Wilson autocratically failed to take Members of the Senate with him to France. What an indictment of Senators this is! In effect, it is charged that Senators turned their back upon this instrument designed for the relief of the world through personal pique, when otherwise they would have approved it!

Mr. Chairman, waste, extravagance, stealing are just as much evils of war as is death and suffering. When nations go to war, especially in the haste that was required of us, and when the entire national resources had to be marshaled, there is no time to devise the safeguards of peace. There is no time to carefully pick and choose the men through whom the work must be done. It is inevitable that when thousands and maybe millions of men must be hastily summoned, some will not be wise in judgment, some will be inefficient, some will be dishonest. In war the fool and the thief have their day. It always has been so, it always will be so as long as the world is afflicted with wars. No honest man can defend waste or thievery. In this war, as in all others, there were mistakes of judgment, there was waste and there was stealing, and responsible persons should be brought to justice, if possible. But, Mr. Chairman, when I think of the gigantic task to which America put herself, the necessity of moving rapidly, of raising, feeding, clothing, and equipping huge armies in a short time, of transporting them across the sea, and this, too, in a few short months; when I think of the mad race to save our allies, ourselves, and the world, as we believe, when I think of the huge success of the effort, the magnificent way in which America responded, the huge sums properly spent, compared to which the waste and stealing was small, I am inclined to thank God that we did so well.

The military miracle of the ages, the wonder of the years is the response of the people to the call of the country. Under the leadership of Mr. Wilson, inspired by his ideals, welded into a united whole by patriotic impulse, the American people worked the supposed impossible and crowned their efforts with success.

It is possibly a salutary rule to hold the administration in power responsible for results, however they may arise, but it is the height of injustice to hold Mr. Wilson responsible for the thefts and waste, when he could have had no supervision of



the work. As much so as to hold the Congress for the theft because, appropriating the money, it made it possible for the thief to steal.

I have heard gentlemen talk as though America had failed. They look only to the inevitable imperfections of human nature and fail to see or declare the wonderful achievements.

These gentlemen are teaching the people, whether they know it or not, that the necessary burdens of the war were not properly or rightfully incurred, and are sowing the seeds of discontent, from whose fruition they will themselves suffer. Let us place the blame where blame belongs; let us punish the guilty, weed out the incompetent, correct mistakes; but let us not lose sight of the worth of the achievement of the people of America; let us not teach the doctrine that their effort was not worth while, that the burdens we bear were not rightfully shouldered upon us and were not worth the results accomplished. To do so is to preach a doctrine that is false. It is neither true, wise, nor patriotic. [Applause.]

I would not have this House believe, Mr. Speaker, that I am representing myself as having been in accord with him on each and every one of the positions taken by him. Such would not be true. The record of my votes since I have been a Member of the House discloses that on a number of occasions I have disagreed with the positions taken by him, and when I have done so I have not hesitated to vote as I thought my duty as a Member of this body made necessary. But I am endeavoring, Mr. Speaker, to indicate somewhat of the worth and value of Mr. Wilson, both in the life of this Nation and of the world.

It has been said that he was cold and aloof and did not have that quality of personal warmth and social disposition that aroused personal attachment and personal loyalty. This charge doubtless comes as somewhat of a surprise to those who have been thrown intimately with him. But what will history care for this? What will history care whether or not the White House was crowded with Members of the Congress or the public in an endeavor by the President to exercise social graces and win a personal affection from you or me? History will not care a bawbee whether you or I dined with the President. It will measure him by his actual accomplishments, his spirit, his ideals, the thoughts he expressed, the concrete accomplishments of the man, his service to his country and to the world. This will be the test of his caliber. This will be the measure of his worth.

As I have stated, he has been charged with stubbornness, of trying to have his way regardless of consequences. And yet he is charged with vacillation and not knowing what he wanted. It is said that he changed his views from time to time and changed his positions accordingly. What man could do other than change his views from time to time during the troublous era through which we have passed? The times were changeable and conditions did not remain the same for long. As the drama of world conflict was played, as the plot unfolded, as we grasped more fully the meaning of the play, old theories had to be laid aside and new ones formed. The thinking of all men was progressive in character; each day old assumptions were laid aside as they were seen to conflict with new developments.

Can it be weakness to change under such circumstances? Is it, rather, not a manifestation of strength to change, disregarding the possible charge of inconsistency and vacillation, from which weak men sometimes quail, or else with the partisanship of opinion held to error once adopted simply because they have declared it truth?

It is not my mission, Mr. Chairman, to depict Mr. Wilson as perfect. No man is. It is not my purpose to state that his administration was without error or mistake. No administration is or will be. But, Mr. Chairman, for some months I have heard him attacked upon the platform, I have heard him and his administration assailed with a bitterness and a personal touch that would have surprised me had I not recalled the experience of other leaders in time of national stress. And more, Mr. Chairman, when by his labors in behalf of his country and humanity his body and health were broken and his voice was hushed and his pen, per force, laid aside, when unable to defend himself and his party, it seemed that the virulence of the attacks were redoubled at a time when by every rule of chivalry it would seem that he would be accorded at least a humanly sympathy.

The coyote barks at the dead lion and challenges him to battle!

[Applause.]

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, and because I feel that as his administration draws to a close it is well to express the belief of some of us as to the greatness of his place in history, I have addressed myself to this subject. He has been the leader

of the Democratic Party, the head of its administration. Under his leadership we have accomplished great things. What will be the verdict of time?

As it views the record of his work in the field of helpful constructive legislation, as it beholds the martial hosts of America assembling at the bugle call of war, to save America and the world, as it listens to his noble appeals for justice, for right, for the well-being of mankind, as it views the ideals pictured by his pen, his enunciation of the purpose and function of government, his declaration of the rights of men as such, what will it say?

As it beholds the laws working good, preventing injustice, making possible the salvation of the world, as it sees America successful in war, the world rescued from imminent menace, what will it say? Will it pronounce his administration and the administration of his party a success or a failure?

Mr. Chairman, impartial history will write Woodrow Wilson among the great men of this country. [Applause.] As long as America exists his figure will stand forth among the world's great. She will call him great in intellect, great in practical achievement, great in love of humanity, great in purpose, lofty in aspiration. His ideals so happily expressed are the leaven in the lump. They will be alive after he is dead. His lesson of the application of ethical principles to the solution of governmental problems will continue to have world-wide and revolutionary effect.

She will call him great leader, great democrat. Ere long America will build him monuments. And when, Mr. Chairman, the entire world comes to the point where right will be substituted for force, as it must some day, either presently or in the future I know not, history will point backward to the figure of Wilson, preaching peace on earth, good will toward men, his faith in the ability of man so to order his existence a potent force in its accomplishment. Truly will she say of Wilson, the President—

Master of minds,  
Eternal foe of kings,  
Humble yet proud,  
The host of smaller men.  
His work was made within the mind of God,  
Eternal peace his watchword and his aim.

[Applause.]

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, during the consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill a few days ago, I took occasion to comment upon the parcel-post statistics given in the annual report of the Postmaster General. My purpose was to show that these statistics were unreliable and, in fact, absurd. We know that the Postal Service is now running behind at the rate of about thirty-five or forty million dollars a year, and it is important to find out the leak. The Postmaster General's annual report stated that the total number of parcels was 2,250,000,000 with an average weight of 4.9 pounds each. I called attention to the fact that this would make a total volume in weight of that class of mail of 11,000,000,000 pounds, which, if it were true, would constitute more than 80 per cent of the total volume of the mail. Any person who has taken occasion to observe, or who knows anything about the postal business, knows that this quantity was entirely too high. I called attention to it to prove that the departmental reports gave us no reliable information. The report further stated that the income was \$150,000,000 and the cost \$140,000,000. After the publication of the report I sent a letter to the department calling attention to this absurdity in the quantity of parcels carried and I received a letter from Mr. Koons, which I shall insert in the RECORD at this point, stating that there had been a mistake, that the number of parcels was 1,250,000,000 and that the average weight was 3.54 pounds instead of 4.9 pounds. I assume, therefore, for the purpose of argument, that the revised figures are correct:

In answer to your letter of the 9th instant calling attention to the inconsistency in the total number of pieces of parcel-post mail handled during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1920, 2,250,000,000; the average weight per parcel, 4.9 pounds; and the percentage of increase in weight, 55 per cent, as shown in the annual report of the Postmaster General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1920, I find upon looking into the matter that, through a clerical error, the total number of parcels was computed on the basis of parcel-post business done at the 50 largest post offices, instead of the business done at all post offices; which, of course, greatly increased the estimate of the total number of pieces handled, inasmuch as approximately 55 per cent of the entire postal business is transacted at the 50 largest offices. According to the count kept from October 1 to October 15, 1919, the total number of parcels handled was approximately 1,250,000,000, and the average weight per parcel was approximately 3.54 pounds.

It is exceedingly regretted that this error occurred.

Very truly, yours,

J. C. KOONS,  
First Assistant Postmaster General.

Mr. Koons also appeared before the Appropriation Committee and explained the matter as follows:

It says that the average weight of all parcels was 4 pounds 9 ounces; that should be 3 $\frac{1}{2}$  pounds; also that the 2,250,000,000 parcels should be 1,250,000,000. The statistician in making up the figures made an error by taking the figures for 50 largest offices instead of for the entire country. When the parcel post was established the revenue from fourth-class matter was \$12,000,000. We have had an account made which shows that the revenue from parcel post has grown to more than \$140,000,000 per year.

But this explanation does not explain. I have examined "Parcel Post Statistics," giving the result of the 15 days' count in October, 1919, and the same gives the number of parcels mailed in the 50 largest post offices as 28,952,431 and the average weight as 3 pounds 3 ounces. How the statistician could get an average of 4.9 pounds from 3 pounds 3 ounces is difficult to understand. The other groups of offices give the average weight as follows:

Other first-class offices, 4 pounds 1 ounce.  
Total first-class offices, 3 pounds 5 ounces.  
Second-class city-delivery offices, 4 pounds 5 ounces.  
Total city-delivery offices, 3 pounds 6 ounces.  
Second-class noncity delivery, 3 pounds 10 ounces.  
Total second-class offices, 4 pounds 3 ounces.  
Total first and second class offices, 3 pounds 6 ounces.  
Third-class offices, 4 pounds 5 ounces.  
Fourth-class offices, 5 pounds 3 ounces.  
All post offices, 3 pounds 8 ounces.

It will be noted that in no group is the average weight as high as given in the Postmaster General's report. The "statistician," whoever he may be, will have another guess coming if he is to clear this matter.

Mr. Koons now places the total number of parcels at 1,250,000,000 and the average weight per parcel at 3.54 pounds, and for the sake of argument we will now take these as the basis of a new calculation and see what the result will be.

Multiplying the number of pieces by the weight we have 4,425,000,000 pounds. The cost of transportation is 2.08 cents and of handling 1.45 cents, a total per pound of 3.53 cents. Multiplying the total pounds by the cost per pound we have a total cost of last year's parcel-post business of \$156,202,500. The department's parcel-post statistics for 1920, page 56, based on actual count for 15 days in October, 1919, at all post offices, show receipts of \$4,763,497.37, which multiplied by 24 gives the annual receipts of \$114,823,936.88, which deducted from the above total cost shows a loss of \$41,878,564 per annum.

In arriving at the cost of handling and transporting parcels the department calculates that 66 per cent of the parcels were "delivered without additional cost." That is to say, they allowed nothing for the work of delivering more than two-thirds of the parcels, presumably on the theory that the clerks and carriers were employed anyway, and if they had not handled and delivered parcels they would not have done anything. Manifestly this is erroneous and reduces the cost figures by many millions. Parcel post, according to the above estimates, consists of 61 per cent of the total volume of the mail, and should bear a large part of the cost of carriers and clerks, as well as rural-delivery and star-route service.

The total revenue of the department last year was \$436,000,000, and according to the above calculation, based on parcel-post statistics, the revenue of that class of mail was \$114,000,000, or 26 per cent of the total. Why 61 per cent of the total volume of mail should pay only 26 per cent of the total revenue should be explained. It is obvious from the above that the department's explanation of the original figures in the annual report does not help to clear up the matter. Even basing our calculations on the amended figures, it indicates an enormous loss. Instead of furnishing the information which the law requires, we are left in darkness, both on the cost of this service and the revenue derived therefrom. There seems to have been a well-planned design to disregard the parcel-post law which provides that if the Postmaster General shall find on experience that the rates of postage "are such as to prevent the shipment of articles desirable, or to permanently render the cost of service greater than the receipts of the revenue therefrom," he is authorized from time to time to reform such rates "in order to promote the service to the public or to insure the receipt of revenue from such service adequate to pay the cost thereof." (Sec. 445, P. L. and P. R.)

When, on initiative of the Postmaster General, Congress was induced to delegate to the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to prescribe the compensation to the railroads for carrying the mails, it brought on a deficit for the last four years of more than \$85,000,000, and the delegation to the Postmaster General of the power to prescribe postage rates on parcels has brought still heavier losses, which accounts for the enormous postal deficit with which we are now confronted. We

must again place the service upon a sound financial basis. The postal deficit should be speedily wiped out, and the taxpayers relieved from that burden, and to do this we must have accurate knowledge. This we hope to get through the investigation now in progress under the direction of the Joint Commission on Postal Service.

When we have obtained the requisite information, it will be for us to consider whether it is not safer and wiser for Congress to itself prescribe all postage rates, rather than to delegate that power to a Cabinet officer who may be tempted to abuse it to gain popular favor for his party. This power to prescribe postage rates is really a part of the power to tax, which our fundamental law has placed in the hands of the representatives of the people, and to delegate it as we have done to an official not directly responsible to the people is contrary to the spirit of our institutions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEENERSON. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, having objected to these other gentlemen, I am very sorry I can not withhold the objection now.

Mr. STEENERSON. Does the gentleman object to the extension of remarks?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I hope the gentleman can modify his request and make it to revise his remarks.

Mr. STEENERSON. I shall certainly modify the request in any way the gentleman wishes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I am sorry, but I have to object.

Mr. STEENERSON. I ask consent to revise them.

Mr. McCLINTIC. All right; I have no objection to the gentleman revising his remarks.

Mr. STEENERSON. Has the gentleman any objection to my printing this manuscript here? It is only—

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I called attention to the immense amount of money that has been wasted, and also the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNOTSON], the Republican whip, called attention to that fact, and I am sorry—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has the right to object if he so desires, and the Chair understands the gentleman to object.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman asked to revise his remarks. The Chairman did not hear the request.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I have no objection to the revision of the remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to revise his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield seven and a half minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER], if he is in the Chamber—

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, just a minute. We have visitors in the gallery who might get a bad impression if they saw only four Members on this side, and I am going to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman made the point of order, or is he merely suggesting it?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman to make the point.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The committee divided; and the tellers (Mr. ROGERS and Mr. McCLINTIC) reported that there were ayes 3, noes 60.

So the motion to rise was rejected.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Now, Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum is not present.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anderson	Bland, Ind.	Cantrill	Cullen
Anthony	Bland, Mo.	Carew	Currie, Mich.
Ayres	Britten	Casey	Davey
Babka	Brooks, Pa.	Clark, Fla.	Dent
Baer	Brumbaugh	Clark, Mo.	Dewalt
Bee	Burroughs	Clary	Donovan
Begg	Butler	Copley	Doelling
Benson	Byrnes, S. C.	Costello	Doremus
Blackmon	Caldwell	Crago	Drewry



Duan	Husted	Mead	Scott
Dupré	Igoe	Milligan	Scully
Eagle	James, Mich.	Montague	Sells
Echols	James, Va.	Moon	Sherwood
Edmonds	Jeffers	Mooney	Siegel
Elston	Johnson, Ky.	Moore, Va.	Sims
Emerson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Morin	Slomp
Evans, Nev.	Johnson, Wash.	Mudd	Smith, Idaho
Frear	Johnston, N. Y.	Nelson, Wis.	Smith, Ill.
Gallagher	Kahn	Newton, Minn.	Smith, Mich.
Gallivan	Kelley, Mich.	Nicholls	Smith, N. Y.
Gandy	Kelly, Pa.	Nolan	Smithwick
Gard	Kennedy, Iowa	O'Connell	Snell
Godwin, N. C.	Kennedy, R. I.	Oldfield	Stephens, Miss.
Goldfogle	Kettner	Oliver	Stiness
Goodall	Kincheloe	Olney	Sullivan
Goodwin, Ark.	Kitchin	Overstreet	Swope
Goodykoontz	Klecza	Padgett	Tague
Gould	Kreider	Paige	Taylor, Colo.
Graham, Pa.	Langley	Parker	Tillman
Griest	Leshar	Perlmán	Tinkham
Griffin	Linthicum	Pou	Upshaw
Hamill	Little	Rainey, Ala.	Vare
Hamilton	Loneragan	Rainey, Henry T.	Vestal
Harrell	Longworth	Rainey, John W.	Vinson
Harrison	Luhrling	Ramsey	Voigt
Haugen	McArthur	Reavis	Volk
Hayden	McCulloch	Reed, W. Va.	Ward
Hays	McGlennon	Riordan	Watson
Hersman	McKenzie	Robinson, N. C.	Welty
Hickey	McKinley	Romjue	Whaley
Hill	McKinley	Rowan	Wilson, Ill.
Hoey	McLane	Rowe	Wilson, Pa.
Holland	MacGregor	Rubey	Winslow
Hulings	Maher	Sabath	Wise
Hull, Iowa	Major	Sanders, Ind.	Wood, Ind.
Hull, Tenn.	Mann, S. C.	Sanders, N. Y.	Wright
	Mansfield	Sanford	Yates

Thereupon the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 15872, the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, finding itself without a quorum, he had ordered the roll to be called, when 220 persons, a quorum, responded to their names, and that he presented the names of the absentees for insertion in the Journal and RECORD.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7½ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] if he is in the Chamber. If not, I yield the same amount of time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

Mr. SMALL. May I inquire if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is here?

Mr. BLANTON. I wish to state that I am always here.

Mr. SMALL. I yield 7½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yesterday gave notice that on to-day I would seek to offer the following motion to recommend the Agricultural bill, with instructions to the committee to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments, to-wit:

On page 2, line 22, strike out "messengers or laborers—16 at \$840 each, 8 at \$720 each."

On page 2, line 24, after the "—," strike out "30 at \$840 each."

On page 3, line 2, strike out "8 messengers or laborers at \$600 each"; and in line 3 strike out "1 \$720, 7 at \$600 each."

On page 5, line 9, strike out "messengers or laborers—28 at \$720 each, 6 at \$660 each, 22 at \$600 each"; and in line 11, after the "—," strike out "11 at \$600 each"; and immediately following such language strike out "100" and insert in lieu thereof "10."

On page 8, line 21, strike out "2 messengers and custodians, at \$1,200 each," and in line 24 strike out "messengers or laborers—11 at \$840 each, 29 at \$720 each."

On page 9, line 1, strike out "2 at \$660 each, 3 at \$600 each, 5 at \$540 each," and in line 2 strike out "15" and insert in lieu thereof "5."

On page 17, line 10, strike out "22" and insert in lieu thereof "2," and in line 11, after the "—," strike out "5 at \$660 each, 14 at \$600 each," and in line 12 strike out "10" and insert in lieu thereof "3."

On page 42, line 5, strike out "2 messengers at \$840 each," and in line 6 strike out "1 \$720, 8 at \$600 each, 3 at \$540 each," and strike out "6" and insert in lieu thereof "3."

On page 46, line 1, strike out "messenger, \$840," and in line 2 strike out "messenger or laborer, \$660."

On page 49, line 2, strike out: "messengers or laborers—2 at \$900 each; 1 \$840; 1 \$720"; and, in line 3, strike out "6" and insert in lieu thereof "3."

On page 52, line 15, strike out "messenger, \$720" and after the "—" in said line 15 strike out "1 \$600."

On page 55, line 22, strike out "messenger, \$720," and in said line 22 strike out "\$600" and insert in lieu thereof "\$480."

On page 56, line 17, strike out: "Messengers or laborers—3 at \$900 each, 10 at \$840 each, 4 at \$780 each, 10 at \$720 each, 3 at \$600 each"; and, in line 20, strike out: "8 at \$720 each, 6 at \$600 each."

On page 58, line 9, strike out: "2 messengers or laborers at \$720 each," and in line 10 strike out "\$600" and insert in lieu thereof "\$480"; and also in said line 10 strike out "3 at \$600 each."

On page 60, line 4, strike out "messenger, \$1,000," and, in line 5, strike out "messengers or laborers—2 at \$840 each, 5 at \$720 each, 2 at \$600 each, 1 \$480"; and, in line 7, strike out "4 at \$600 each" and strike out "11" and insert in lieu thereof "3."

On page 65, line 19, strike out: "Messengers or laborers—2 at \$840 each, 2 at \$600 each, 4 at \$600 each, 4 messengers," and that part of the balance of said line 21 ending with "\$720 each"; and in line 22

strike out "3 at \$600 each" and strike out "8" and insert in lieu thereof "2."

On page 70, line 3, strike out: "Messengers—4 at \$900 each, 2 at \$720 each"; and, in line 4, strike out "3 at \$660 each, 12 at \$600 each, 15 at \$540 each"; and in line 5 strike out "20" and insert in lieu thereof "3."

And on page 76, line 7, strike out: "1 \$600, 1 \$480."

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman in charge of the bill could have permitted this motion to have been passed upon by this House, which would have saved \$300,000 every year by striking out this surplus unnecessary messenger service, but he purposely moved the previous question, which kept me from offering my motion, which otherwise I could have done. And if he had not premeditatedly demanded the previous question, and kept me from getting my motion before the House, which he did to keep his colleagues from being forced into going on record for or against this motion for retrenchment, the people of the United States could possibly have saved \$300,000 by a vote on that proposition. I want to say in that connection, also, that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], the majority leader, failed and refused to vote on the proposition that put back into this bill \$1,000,000 appropriated to buy a lot of mountain tops that we could have done without, that the country does not need, and he refused in a close vote to come here and vote and go on record on that proposition. And at the same time, in this very bill, he permitted, because he is floor leader and he had a right to attempt to whip his colleagues into line on a proposition to save money—he permitted them, because of his inaction, to vote \$360,000 for free seed into this bill, at a time when his country is facing a \$3,000,000,000 deficit. That is the kind of legislation that my friends on the majority side of the aisle permit to go into appropriation bills at this time, following a World War, when they promised retrenchment; when on the hustings they promised the people of this country they would reduce the taxes. If you keep on putting items of this kind into bills, you can not reduce taxes; you can not carry out your promise. If we could have secured only two more votes on this seed proposition last night, we could have saved all this money for the people of the United States. I am taking this time to put the blame where it belongs, on my Republican friends on the majority side, who have 46 majority in this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full compensation for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, for the objects hereinafter expressed, namely:

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw the point, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ambassadors extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, China, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, and Spain, at \$17,500 each, \$227,500.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the item of "China." Our mission to China is that of minister; and it takes an act of Congress to elevate it to that of ambassador. There has been no legislation of Congress to that effect, and it is attempted by the Appropriations Committee in this bill. That committee has no legislative power. We have stripped all the other committees of the power of appropriation, but I do not think we ought to strip them of legislative power.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair understand, if possible, the point of order made by the gentleman from Virginia. He made the point of order that the item of "China," in the first paragraph, is new legislation?

Mr. FLOOD. New legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes a point of order on that item?

Mr. FLOOD. I do.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a further point of order against the ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Belgium, because there is no law authorizing it.

Mr. ROGERS. I suggest we have one point of order disposed of at a time.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not want to lose my right. I wanted it understood at the same time that that is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] say to the point of order made by the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. ROGERS. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that of Belgium, because it is a new item in this bill and is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the gentleman from Massachusetts say about that?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, there is a statute authorizing the sending of an ambassador to Belgium. It is the act of September 29, 1919, and reads as follows:

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint as the representative of the United States an ambassador to the Kingdom of Belgium, who shall receive as compensation the sum of \$17,500 per annum.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. ROGERS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to change the amount carried by the paragraph from \$227,500 to \$210,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS: Page 2, line 5, strike out "\$227,500" and insert "\$210,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask my colleague on the committee whether there is not a law which now provides for an ambassador to Russia?

Mr. ROGERS. There is a law which authorizes the Congress to appropriate for an ambassador to Russia if Congress so desires. The Committee on Appropriations did not deem the necessity for an ambassador so apparent at this moment as to authorize the inclusion of the item in the bill.

Mr. MASON. May I continue my question? In case we resume our relations with Russia within the next few months, as we are likely to. Great Britain has, and we always do what Great Britain does—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Not always.

Mr. MASON. We have had no skip for eight years. Would it not be well that I offer an amendment, after the words "Great Britain," to insert in line 4 the word "Russia"? Of course, if we do not appoint an ambassador—

Mr. ROGERS. Let the amendment be reported first before the gentleman debates it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, let the amendment be reported before it is debated.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to offer an amendment?

Mr. MASON. Yes. After the word "Spain," in line 4, insert the word "Russia."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MASON: Page 2, line 4, after the word "Spain," insert the word "Russia."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I am confined to five minutes, I suppose, on that amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MASON. I will if it is not too long.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman think it wise to send a representative of the United States Government to any country that repudiates its own national debts?

Mr. MASON. The gentleman asks a question that takes a long time to answer. Russia is not repudiating its own national debts. I disagree with you on the statement, and therefore I do not care to be interrupted in my five minutes.

Russia has a government that has been running now for a long time. Whether it is a wise and satisfactory government to the United States or not is not a question for us to pass upon at this time. Later on we are to pass upon the question as to whether we will send this ambassador to Russia. The appropriation for it now can do no harm, but it will be there in case the next President of the United States decides to make a treaty, as Great Britain has been doing. The truth of the matter is that the propaganda that has been used in the United States against the people's government in Russia has simply been carried on to keep us from getting the trade and the busi-

ness of that government. You and I may not agree with them as to their socialistic ideas as to the division of property, but they have been here and they have offered to trade with us. They are running a peaceful government. Those that I read from say they have the best government they ever had in Russia. On the other side, we hear that they have not the best government.

But there is a propaganda in this country now; certain newspapers are carrying it on. This man, Mr. Boris Bakhmeteff, who has been recognized by the President of the United States, who represents nobody, came here originally representing the Kerensky government, and afterwards stayed on. They reported, in answer to my question before the committee of investigation, that \$138,000,000 had been paid to him, and gave an itemized statement signed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and now it seems that from the report—and I have written the honorable Secretary of State about it, but can get no answer—it seems now that they did not pay out that money. I say to you, gentlemen and my colleagues, that, in my opinion, one of the nest of grafters that has robbed the American people has been this artificial man here, Boris Bakhmeteff, who has held on as a representative. There was three hundred and odd million dollars in his hands at the close of the war. The Secretary of State testified before the committee, in response to my resolution, that they had used him to pay out this money to settle with American contractors, under supervision of the Secretary of State and Secretary of the Treasury, and then refuse to give details, because they say the information is privileged, and also testified that many millions had been used to pay for Russian ships. Now the statement is made that that money was not paid, but that the United States is holding it until they can get a receipt for it.

Now, as a matter of fact, my offer of this amendment is simply to have that appropriation ready, so that in case we decide to follow the illustrious example of Great Britain and open trade relations with Russia, that appropriation will be available. They want our goods and our friendship, and they want to buy of and sell to us. It is a part of the conspiracy between our good friends that we have been fighting with to keep us from settling with Russia in order that Great Britain—particularly Great Britain—can enjoy that trade, and on every dollar of the trade that we are doing to-day with Russia—and we are doing some—we have to pay tribute to the English and French merchants before it is done.

I think it would be fair to put that amendment in. The next President, who takes his seat in a few weeks, can decide upon taking the initiative with Russia. Of course, I know the statements that are made against the bolsheviks. But from my conversation with the people who have been there, and the reports that I gather from people who are unprejudiced, I am informed that the present government of Russia has done more for the education and improvement of the people there than has ever been done before in the history of that nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the Congress of the United States favors the policy of appropriating for a lot of ambassadors and ministers who are not going to be utilized or needed during the fiscal year contemplated in this bill.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. ROGERS. In a moment. We have had no ambassador in Russia for several years. There is no ambassador appropriated for in the current law; and the Committee on Appropriations, in omitting the item from the bill now before the Committee of the Whole, has simply followed the policy of the Committee on Foreign Affairs as reflected in the bill of a year ago. It may be—no one can say at this moment—that before June 30, 1922, it will be desirable to have some kind of representative from the United States in Russia; but whether that representative should be an ambassador, a minister, a commissioner, a chargé d'affaires, a secretary, or a consul general, no one can now predict. If the question arises it can perfectly well be dealt with very promptly by Congress after we know what the condition of Russia is and what the need of this country in the matter of representation to Russia shall prove to be at that time. And even without congressional action the President can send there a diplomatic representative.

Mr. FLOOD and Mr. RAMSEYER rose.

Mr. ROGERS. I yield first to my colleague from Virginia [Mr. Flood].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I approve of some of the statements made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, but I do not think his reasoning is consistent with some other provisions of



this bill. There is an appropriation made for an ambassador to Germany, and an appropriation for a minister to Austria and for a minister to Hungary. We are at war with those countries to-day, and there is no more certainty that we will have diplomatic relations with them after the 1st of next July than with Russia. We have no ambassador to Mexico, yet we have an appropriation for one.

Mr. ROGERS. Let the gentleman take the floor in his own right if he wishes. Let me answer the suggestion he has made. In the first place, we have to-day diplomatic representation in Berlin, in Vienna, and in Budapest, which entirely differentiates the situation to start with from the situation in Russia, where we have no diplomatic representation. It is probable that at this moment, and if not at this moment then within a very few months, it will be desirable to have an ambassador or minister to Germany, to Austria, and to Hungary. I repeat, no one can say what the situation is going to be with regard to Russia. Again I say, that in the matter of Germany, the Committee on Appropriations is simply following out the policy recommended last year by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] is the ranking Democratic member. There is an appropriation for Germany carried in the current Diplomatic and Consular law and, although it has not been utilized up to this moment, it seems exceedingly likely that it will be utilized within a short time.

Mr. FLOOD. It is not only carried in the current law but was carried in preceding years during the time we were at war with Germany.

Mr. ROGERS. That makes the argument still stronger for carrying the item for Germany. Russia has no appropriation in the current law.

Mr. FLOOD. There was one before the current law.

Mr. ROGERS. Oh, well, we are carrying out the policy of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as expressed in the current Diplomatic and Consular act. Now I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Ramseyer].

Mr. RAMSEYER. The question I intended to ask was along the line of the question asked by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood]. It does seem to me that there is no more reason for excluding Russia than there would be for excluding Germany, and that there was no more reason for excluding Russia in the first place than there was for excluding Germany, and Germany never was excluded from the bill.

Mr. ROGERS. I am not prepared to say whether the judgment of the Congress as expressed in the last Diplomatic and Consular act was sound or not; but as far as these belligerent countries are concerned, and certainly as far as Germany and Russia are concerned, we have followed the policy of a year ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move to strike out the last word. I am very much interested in the statement of the chairman of the subcommittee, that at the present time our Government has diplomatic representatives in Berlin, Vienna, and Budapest. I wish to ask what is their authority for so acting while we are technically in a state of war with Germany and Austria?

Mr. ROGERS. They are sent there under the authority of the President and the Secretary of State, and they are intended to protect the interests, especially the commercial interests, of the United States in these three countries.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Has there been any official recognition of these diplomatic representatives of the Government of the United States by the Government of Germany?

Mr. ROGERS. I am unable to answer that question. I should say that they were there in a semi-official capacity. The several men are known as commissioners.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman made the broad statement that they were there as diplomatic representatives of the Government of the United States.

Mr. ROGERS. They are diplomatic representatives.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I make the motion for the purpose of trying to get a little clearer notion in my own mind as to what ought to be done with the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois. I have observed in the papers recently that England is removing trade restrictions with Russia. Certainly those people are soon going to begin to trade with somebody. Their international and trade attitude, I believe, is now being formed. Now, it would seem to me that if we need somebody in Germany and Austria now to represent us, and are warranted in having them there, that the same reason would obtain with reference to Russia. I do not make the statement on any assurance that I know anything about it. I do not suggest. I inquire.

Mr. ROGERS. The difference, as it seems to me, is here: In Germany and Austria and Hungary the status of the three countries as members of the family of nations is fairly well

crystallized, and the best proof of that is that the President of the United States and the Department of State, whether rightly or wrongly I would not like to assert, have diplomatic representatives at those places. No one can say what the status of Russia in the family of nations is going to be. We can not at this time predict what representative we should have there.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I have in mind that there is great possibility of a change in the affairs in Europe and that we are being jockeyed out of a good deal of trade with Russia, which we are entitled to and which somebody else is going to get.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Without discussing the merits, does not the gentleman overlook the fact that this Government recognizes the present existing Governments of Germany, Austria, and Hungary, but it does not recognize the existing government in Russia, and a provision in a bill of this kind for the appointment of an ambassador to Russia would be a legal recognition?

Mr. FLOOD. If the gentleman will pardon me, this Government refused to recognize the Government of Mexico, and through all the years the bill contained an appropriation for a representative to Mexico. The status was the same with reference to Mexico as it is in reference to Russia to-day.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say that the ambassador during that time drew the salary when he had nothing to do but stay here in Washington most of the time.

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, yes; he was doing some work at the State Department.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield to the whole House at once. I want to address myself to the chairman of the committee. The point I make, as it occurs, is that it is about time, in what capacity I do not know, we have somebody over in Russia, if we can get him there, to see what is happening there. There are some big things happening in Europe, and Russia, Russian trade, and Russia's place in the world's future, now being fixed, are not among the least important. That is what I think, as a matter of horse sense, without professing any definite knowledge of the facts or any diplomatic ability.

Mr. ROGERS. We can send a diplomat under the Constitution now.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Then, why not provide for him in the bill and send him?

Mr. ROGERS. We do not want to send an ambassador there now as far as we can predict.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary to Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the Netherlands and Luxemburg, and Poland, at \$12,000 each, \$48,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. I want to ask the chairman what authority in law there is for envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary to Czechoslovakia and Poland?

Mr. ROGERS. Under the Constitution of the United States the President has the right to recognize foreign countries and to appoint ambassadors and ministers. The President has recognized both Czechoslovakia and Poland. The President has appointed a minister, and the Senate has confirmed the appointment, in each case. The Congress of the United States, pursuant to that Executive act and in accordance with the authority flowing from the act, has provided for the salary of the representative.

Mr. BLANTON. Under the same authority, the President could send an envoy extraordinary to any country in the world?

Mr. ROGERS. Provided the Senate confirmed the appointment and provided Congress appropriated for his salary.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the word "Czechoslovakia" and also "Poland," because there is no substantive law providing for those positions at a salary of \$12,000 each.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to be heard?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, there is a general provision of law, which will be found in section 1675 of the Revised Statutes, that the salaries of ministers to all countries not expressly mentioned elsewhere shall be \$10,000. So far as the point of order relates to Czechoslovakia and Poland, the statutory maximum amount would be \$10,000 each; therefore the point of order is good in so far as the inclusion of these two offices in this \$12,000 paragraph is concerned. The point of order, if sustained, would, of course, not prevent the inclusion of these two offices in the next paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not admit that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ROGERS: Page 2, line 6, after the word "to," at the end of the line, insert "China," and change the amount at the end of the line from "\$48,000" to "\$80,000."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all totals be adjusted by the Clerk in accordance with the action of the House, and that that portion of the amendment referring to the total be stricken out of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the Clerk may have the right to correct the totals throughout the bill after the committee has made its report, and to modify his amendment in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ROGERS: Page 2, at the end of line 6, after the word "to," insert the word "China."

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on that. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry as to what is left in the paragraph to which the point of order was made, which was sustained by the Chair a moment ago.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understood it, the point of order ran to Czechoslovakia and Poland.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. And the Netherlands and Luxemburg and Cuba were left in the paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would think so.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. What about the figures "\$12,000"?

The CHAIRMAN. That would apply only to those left in the paragraph.

Mr. WINGO. I thought the point of order went to the paragraph?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I did not make it to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order went to Czechoslovakia and Poland. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary to Austria, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Uruguay, Persia, Portugal, Rumania, Salvador, Siam, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and Venezuela, at \$10,000 each, and to the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, \$10,000; in all, \$290,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no such office as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Turkey, as provided for by the present law, with a salary of \$10,000, and that there is no such office also provided for by law for Finland, for the Serbs, the Croats, or the Slovenes.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the gentleman from Massachusetts say to the point of order?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman makes the point of order as to Turkey, Finland, the Serbs, the Croats, and Slovenes.

As far as Turkey is concerned—and I should like, if I may be permitted, a separate ruling upon each of these points of order—the law for many years has authorized the sending of an ambassador to that country. Until the current appropriation act there has been for many years an ambassador to Turkey, dating back, as I recall it, to 1906 or thereabout. Last year the item was omitted for the first time from the appropriation act. But that omission does not in any way change the fundamental authority for a subsequent appropriation another year. Therefore Congress would have the right to appoint an ambassador at \$17,500. If we did so, the item would have been carried in the first paragraph which we have just passed. We, however, now propose a minister to Turkey for the ensuing year. That minister will receive, if he is appointed, the salary of \$10,000 a year, instead of an ambassador's salary of \$17,500. The contention of the committee, therefore, is that the recommendation is in order under the Holman rule, because it retrenches expenditures.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Suppose we appointed a minister who was not provided for by law at a salary of \$10,000, and that as soon as Congress meets on April 4 in special session a deficiency appropriation subcommittee, which would not be presided over

by the gentleman from Massachusetts, should then bring in a deficiency appropriation providing for an ambassador at \$17,500 to Turkey, which is provided for by law. Then we will have two officers, one at \$17,500 a year and another at \$10,000 a year, and the \$10,000 is not authorized by law, what effect does that have upon the Holman rule?

Mr. ROGERS. Does not the gentleman think that if a minister is appropriated for under this paragraph it would automatically wipe out, as far as the next fiscal year is concerned, the authority to appropriate for an ambassador?

Mr. BLANTON. No; what we do with this little appropriation bill has nothing whatever to do with the legislation of the country, the substantive law of the country. All of these are statutory positions. The gentleman knows that as well as I do.

Mr. ROGERS. Of course, there can not be a minister and an ambassador to the same capital at the same time. Therefore, if you appropriate for a minister here, as a matter of common sense we can not and shall not appropriate for or appoint an ambassador.

Mr. BLANTON. The trouble is that the law authorizes an ambassador at \$17,500 and does not authorize a minister at \$10,000.

Mr. ROGERS. It authorizes a diplomatic representative. I do not regard the name as being as important as the office. I submit that the provision clearly involves a retrenchment.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts allow the Chair to ask him a question?

Mr. ROGERS. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. We are unable to find at the Chair's desk any authorization of an ambassador to Turkey. Is that of a subsequent act?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the situation with respect to the creation of ambassadors is somewhat complex. The act of Congress of March 1, 1893, provided that—

Whenever the President shall be advised that any foreign Government is represented in the United States by an ambassador or envoy extraordinary, minister plenipotentiary, minister resident, special envoy, or chargé d'affaires, he is authorized, in his discretion, to direct that the representative of the United States to such Government shall bear the same designation, and this provision shall in no wise affect the duties, powers, or salaries of such representative.

That is the situation down from 1893 to 1909. In the act approved March 2, 1909, Thirty-fifth Statutes at Large, page 672, the foregoing provision of 1893 was repealed and the following language was substituted:

And hereafter no ambassadorship shall be created unless the same shall be provided by act of Congress.

The effect of those two laws taken together is that the ambassadors appointed by the President from 1893 to 1909 were validly appointed and were entitled under the Diplomatic and Consular act to the salary for an ambassador. The ambassador to Turkey was created in 1906, before the repealer of 1909. Therefore I think there can be no question as to the validity of the appointment of an ambassador to Turkey in 1909.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that does not seem to be a direct authorization of an ambassador under the law. Is not that the difficulty in this case?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, is the meaning of the act of 1893 entirely clear to the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. It appears to the Chair that unless the President appoints an ambassador there is not authority in law for the pay of an ambassador.

Mr. ROGERS. But the President appointed an ambassador to Turkey by reason of the authority of the act of 1893 on or about the 1st of July, 1906. Therefore, in my view, the transaction was then complete and valid. He had complete authority given by the act of 1893; an ambassador was duly created and the office has been filled ever since until diplomatic relations were severed shortly before our entrance into the World War.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, may I respectfully suggest that even though there be authority of law that the Holman rule would not be applicable under the peculiar situation which exists here, and I think it would be unfortunate to apply the Holman rule to this situation lest we create a precedent that might be extremely embarrassing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Tennessee that he is going to interrogate the gentleman from Massachusetts as to his view whether or not it could be held as being a subordinate office inclusive in the larger or higher grade. The Chair himself has very serious doubts as to whether or not it could be.

Mr. GARRETT. If the Chair will indulge me, I have only a very brief suggestion to make. The Holman rule is a technical rule; it is a rule that has been strictly construed and that



ought to be strictly construed, and being technical, it should be technically applied.

Now, if it were applicable, it should have been invoked by the provision of an express amendment in the paragraph that was read just before this, which provided for ambassadors, and there should have been, then, a repealer put in. Now, you have passed the ambassadors' paragraph and have come to the ministers' paragraph. We read these appropriation bills by paragraphs and deal with them by paragraphs. You have passed the period, therefore, where the law might have been repealed, even if the Holman rule would have applied so as to bring in a repealer. That was on the other paragraph. You are now dealing with this paragraph standing alone, and it puts in a new office, confessedly.

Those things I am suggesting, and I am suggesting this purely on the point of order, because, if I may be indulged for a moment, I am in sympathy with the purpose the committee has in mind. While I am in favor of a strict application of the old rule of the House with the new situation which has arisen by reason of the so-called budget rule, at the same time I am a little bit afraid that, in dealing with these foreign matters, it is somewhat unfortunate that the point of order has been made as to this Czechoslovak minister and the ministers to these other countries, because it may be understood, if the bill passes this House and fails to carry them, we are treading on very dangerous ground, and I am afraid if the Chair has to sustain the point of order—and he may have to sustain it—it should be followed by legislation coming from the legislative committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] concede the point of order as to Finland and the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes?

Mr. ROGERS. No, Mr. Chairman. The appropriation for the minister to Finland is clearly in order under the constitutional provision I have already referred to. Finland was recognized by the United States on the 7th day of May, 1919, and a minister sent in accordance with the recognition and in accordance with the constitutional power of the President. In other words, this office finds its source and authority directly in the Constitution, the President having recognized the Republic of Finland.

So far as the minister to the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes is concerned, I think the gentleman from Texas will withdraw the point of order. But in any event the point of order is not well taken. In substance this case is like that of Finland. The situation is simply this: We have for many years carried a minister to Serbia at \$10,000 a year. As a result of the wholesale readjustment of territories and races of southeastern Europe, there was an entirely transformed Serbia. Certain people formerly of Croatia, part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, were included in that new country, and certain other Slavic people who call themselves "Slovenes" were also included within the new Serbia. In order to take account of the ethnic situation which resulted, the country called itself the country of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. It is the old Serbia with a new form and a new name. The new country sends a minister to this country whom they call the "minister of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes," and we send a minister to that country who is designated in his commission as the "minister to the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes." This item in no way differs fundamentally from the case of Finland, because, as in the case of Finland, the President of the United States has commissioned a minister to the country of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. Hence the United States Congress, in making this appropriation, is simply recognizing the lawful Executive act of the President.

Mr. FLOOD. Why should not the same rule apply to this country as applies to Finland?

Mr. ROGERS. I think it does apply. But if on any theory the Chair should sustain the point of order, I hope the gentleman from Texas would see that this is simply a substituted name, and in no way modifies the condition that has prevailed for years.

Mr. FLOOD. The recognition of a nation rests with the President?

Mr. ROGERS. Precisely.

Mr. FLOOD. And the President has recognized this nation?

Mr. ROGERS. He has; and he has sent a minister to the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes.

Mr. FLOOD. He has that authority without act of Congress.

Mr. ROGERS. I agree with the gentleman, and I have tried to state that.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I am asking for recognition on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] still has the floor.

Mr. ROGERS. I have completed my discussion of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to ask the gentleman a question. The gentleman seems to think it is quite clear the constitutional authority of the President to appoint ambassadors and ministers, and so forth, authorizes him to do so without other authority of law. Let me call the gentleman's attention to this proposition, that the same authority in the provision of the Constitution that says the President may, by the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint ambassadors and ministers and consuls also says—and which follows immediately—that he may appoint judges of the Supreme Court and other officials of the United States. Certainly the President would never appoint any of these other officers of the United States until Congress has provided for such offices. He would not appoint a judge of a court until Congress had provided for the court. Can it be said that he might under the law appoint an ambassador or what not until Congress has authorized him to do so? I am simply asking that question so that you may discuss it.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the question is unanswerable.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the Constitution of the United States expressly provides for the creation of the inferior courts by act of Congress. The authority is given to constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court. It certainly is not my impression that the President, before appointing members of the Supreme Court, would have been obliged to wait upon the action of Congress.

Whatever the fact may originally have been in that regard, it is perfectly clear that for generations the recognition of foreign countries has been regarded as solely an Executive function. The precedents are almost innumerable to that effect. I should like in this same connection—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman need not cite authorities on that. Of course, the Chair understands that the recognition of a country and the appointment of an ambassador are not necessarily related.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion to the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] has the floor.

Mr. OSBORNE rose.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. OSBORNE. I have a suggestion to make. The suggestion is, that evidently under what the President considers to be his constitutional authority, he has appointed representatives to those new countries who are now serving. In Czechoslovakia Richard Crane is envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, and in Poland Mr. Hugh S. Gibson is envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, and in the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes Mr. H. Percival Dodge has been appointed by the President and is now serving as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary. I just call attention to those facts. The President evidently believes that that is in order.

Mr. ROGERS. I should like, Mr. Chairman, to call the attention of the Chair in this same connection, although I am not sure that it greatly amplifies or indeed modifies the constitutional authority itself, to the organic act of the Department of State.

Mr. OSBORNE. May I add that those names that I have mentioned have been confirmed by the Senate? The Senate evidently thought the President had the authority to make those appointments.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the power to recognize a new State has from the foundation of this Government rested with the Executive, as it does with the executive of all other Governments. That recognition is made manifest by receiving a minister from the new State or appointing a minister on our part to go to the new State to represent us. That has been done since the foundation of the Government without any act of Congress. Until 20 years ago our diplomatic representatives were all ministers plenipotentiary, and we had no ambassadors. Then some ambassadors were created by an act of the Executive, and Congress saw fit to restrict the executive branch in the creation of this higher branch of diplomatic officers, and the only difference we have now is that the President can not appoint an ambassador unless that position has been created by act of Congress. But he has always had the right to appoint ministers to new States without an act of Congress, and the only thing Congress did was to make an appropriation carrying out the appointment made by the President. I think that is perfectly clear.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, this is a point of considerable importance and perhaps of some difficulty. I am going to move in a moment that the committee rise, so that there may be an opportunity for consideration before to-morrow's session. Be-

fore I do so, however, I desire to submit for the consideration of the Chair what is perhaps as nearly the organic act of the United States as affecting the State Department as is to be found in the statutes of the Government. It is contained in Revised Statutes, section 202, and in Barnes Federal Code, section 221. I ask unanimous consent that that be printed in the Record without reading.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the section referred to be printed in the Record without reading. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the section referred to:

SEC. 221. Management of foreign affairs.—The Secretary of State shall perform such duties as shall from time to time be enjoined on or intrusted to him by the President relative to correspondence, commissions, or instructions to or with public ministers or consuls from the United States, or to negotiations with public ministers from foreign states or princes, or to memorials or other applications from foreign public ministers or other foreigners, or to such other matters respecting foreign affairs as the President of the United States shall assign to the department, and he shall conduct the business of the department in such manner as the President shall direct. (R. S., sec. 202; acts July 27, 1789, ch. 4, sec. 1, 1 Stat. 28; Sept. 15, 1789, ch. 14, sec. 1, 1 Stat. 68.)

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman now yield for a question?

Mr. ROGERS. Does the gentleman from Texas object to deferring the question?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no.

Mr. ROGERS. I move, Mr. Chairman, that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15872) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 4719. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear and determine the claim of the owners of the Danish steamship *Flynderborg* against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4039. An act to amend section 3 of the act of Congress of June 28, 1906, entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### TELLERS FOR COUNTING THE ELECTORAL VOTE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint as tellers on the part of the House for the counting of the electoral vote Mr. LAMPERT and Mr. RUCKER.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the bill just considered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the Agricultural appropriation bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 28, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

372. A letter from the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, transmitting statement of receipts and disbursements of money through his hands December 1, 1919, to De-

cember 1, 1920, and a statement of property in his charge December 1, 1920; to the Committee on Accounts.

373. A letter from the president of the Washington & Old Dominion Railway, transmitting annual report of that corporation to Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

374. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of proposed legislation to amend the provision "That hereafter funds appropriated for support of the Army may be used for the procurement of supplies to be held in store for issue to the Army during subsequent years"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

375. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of proposed legislation to permit payment of Army pay claims until June 30, 1922, under the provisions of the Army appropriation bill for 1919; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

376. A letter from East Washington Heights Traction Railroad Co., transmitting annual report of that organization for the year ending December 31, 1920; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Railways and Canals, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10919) to require the Secretary of War to cause to be made a survey for a canal from Cumberland Sound to the mouth of the Mississippi River, and to make full and complete report to Congress of the most feasible route and cost of construction, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1246), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SINNOTT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15445) to provide for the disposition of boron deposits, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1247), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LANGLEY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15714) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of contractors and subcontractors for the post offices and other buildings and work under the supervision of the Treasury Department, and for other purposes," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1249), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15894) to authorize an appropriation to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to provide medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies for persons who served in the World War and are patients of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, Division of Rehabilitation, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1250), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SWINDALL, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15219) to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office to dispose of certain trust funds in his possession, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1251), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STEENERSON, from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15906) to further reclassify postmasters and employees of the Postal Service and readjust their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, and for other purposes, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1252), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. CRAGO, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4324) for the relief of William C. Brown, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1245), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.



Mr. HERNANDEZ, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3138) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and convey to the Great Northern Railway Co. certain lands for stockyards, and for other purposes, at Browning Station, in the State of Montana, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1248), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 15914) to amend the provisions of an act relating to certain railway corporations owning or operating street railways in the District of Columbia, approved June 5, 1905; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 15915) providing for a commission to ascertain and determine the rights of persons occupying Pueblo Indian lands, in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 15916) to amend section 101 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 15917) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Crater National Forest; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 15918) providing for the meeting of electors of President and Vice President, for the issuance and transmission of the certificates of their selection and of the result of their determination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. HAWLEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 15919) to add to the Crater National Forest, in Oregon, certain lands that were reverted in the United States pursuant to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the Oregon & California Railroad Co. against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 15920) to provide for the relief of certain employees of the Government who have become eligible for retirement under the provisions of the retirement act of May 22, 1920, and have thereafter been continued in the service or reemployed therein; also to give to retired employees a limited status for reinstatement in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Resolution (H. Res. 654) authorizing the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress to investigate and report what funds, if any, have been contributed toward contesting the election of any person holding a certificate of election to the House of Representatives of the Sixty-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SNYDER: Resolution (H. Res. 655) for the immediate consideration of H. R. 15876; to the Committee on Rules.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, urging the recognition of President Alvaro Obregon and the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, urging the passage of the Fordney tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENCH: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging the passage of H. R. 14905, for the continuation of Federal aid in the construction of roads; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging that the resolution introduced by Hon. J. W. WADSWORTH, Jr., be adopted and that Federal authorities discontinue the operation of barges, boats, and other transportation facilities on the canal system at the earliest possible moment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERSEY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, favoring legislation which will simplify and expedite the procedure whereby wounded and disabled service men may obtain the benefits to which they are entitled; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging that the resolution introduced by Hon. J. W. WADSWORTH, Jr., be adopted and that Federal authorities discontinue the operation of barges, boats, and other transportation facilities on the canal system at the earliest possible moment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 15921) granting a pension to William F. Leach; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 15922) granting an increase of pension to Archie S. Blackmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 15923) granting an increase of pension to Frederick H. Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15924) for the relief of the dependents of certain members of the Oregon National Guard, who were killed (while serving in the line of duty and not as the result of their own misconduct) by the explosion of a 155-millimeter cannon at Camp Lewis, Wash., on July 16, 1920; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 15925) granting an increase of pension to Marina A. de Lucero; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOCH: A bill (H. R. 15926) granting a pension to Adeline Fender; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15927) granting a pension to Lucia Biddison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 15928) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 15929) granting a pension to Owen Combs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15930) granting a pension to Usley Akers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 15931) for the relief of William McCormack; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINCER: A bill (H. R. 15932) granting a pension to Susie M. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 15933) granting an increase of pension to Hattie Gorse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5307. By Mr. BRIGGS: Petition of the Galveston Commercial Association, indorsing H. R. 15748, providing for reclassification of salaries of clerks and inspectors in the Steamboat-Inspection Service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

5308. By Mr. CRAMTON: Resolution of the delegates representing 18,000 woolgrowers of the State of Michigan in favor of the French-Capper true-fabric bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5309. Also, resolution passed by the executive committee of the St. Clair County Farm Bureau, Port Huron, Mich., asking for the passage of the French-Capper fabric bill (H. R. 11641); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5310. By Mr. CURRY of California: Petition of employees of the United States Steamboat-Inspection Service, favoring House bill 15746, to increase their salaries; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5311. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of the Misses Helena, Catherine, Gertrude, and Ellen Evans, 50 G Street South, Boston, Mass., protesting against Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5312. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles F. Gettemy, corresponding secretary of the Dorchester Woman's Club, favoring passage of Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5313. By Mr. GANLY: Petition of sundry citizens of the Bronx, N. Y., protesting against the occupation of Germany by French colonial troops; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5314. By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: Petition of the Farmers' National Farm Loan Association, of Letts, Iowa, asking that the present injunction against further business by the Federal land bank be dissolved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5315. By Mr. KIESS: Evidence in support of House bill 15645, granting an increase in pension to Abbie J. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5316. By Mr. KING: Petition of Council No. 583 of the Knights of Columbus, Quincy, Ill., favoring recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5317. Also, petition of the Galesburg (Ill.) branch of the Railway Mail Clerks, asking for an increase in salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5318. By Mr. KINKAID: Petition of J. M. Stoetzel and 17 other residents of Scotia, Nebr., and vicinity, against profiteering in oil and gasoline by oil companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5319. Also, petition of the Nebraska State Irrigation Association, indorsing the passage of the emergency tariff bill (H. R. 15275); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5320. Also, petition or memorial of the Nebraska State Irrigation Association, indorsing passage of Senate bill 4561, by Senator CAPPER; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5321. By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the Connecticut Teachers' League, favoring the truth-in-fabric bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5322. Also, petition of Connecticut Teachers' League, regarding preservation of national parks; to the Committee on Water Power.

5323. By Mr. McDUFFIE: Papers to accompany House bill 15624, for the relief of J. E. Hendrix; to the Committee on Claims.

5324. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of the New England Purchasing Agents' Association, Boston, Mass., regarding commercial bribery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5325. By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of the Church of Brethren and Friends, of Grand Junction, Colo., urging the passage of House bill 12652, providing for physical training and education; to the Committee on Education.

5326. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Henry J. Ryan, American Legion headquarters, Indianapolis, Ind., concerning compulsory education in English, American history, and civics in the public and private schools; to the Committee on Education.

5327. Also, petition of the Public Education Association of Worcester, Mass., indorsing the Fess-Capper bill; to the Committee on Education.

5328. Also, petition of the New England Purchasing Agents' Association, favoring the decentralized plan of railroads, and legislation for the punishment of commercial bribery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, January 28, 1921.

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 26, 1921.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	Lodge	Smith, Ariz.
Ball	Hale	McCumber	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Harris	McKellar	Smith, Md.
Borah	Harrison	McLean	Smith, S. C.
Brandeggee	Heflin	McNary	Smoot
Calder	Henderson	Moses	Spencer
Capper	Hitchcock	Myers	Stanley
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Sutherland
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Thomas
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Page	Townsend
Dial	Kellogg	Penrose	Trammell
Dillingham	Kendrick	Phipps	Underwood
Elkins	Kenyon	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Keyes	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
France	King	Robinson	Williams
Gerry	Kirby	Sheppard	Willis
Gooding	Lenroot	Simmons	

Mr. BALL. I desire to announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] are absent on official business of the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] are engaged in a hearing before the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. HARRISON. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WORCOTT] are detained from the Senate by reason of illness.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to state that the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is detained from the Senate on important business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In compliance with the standing order of the Senate of the United States that at the conclusion of the reading of the Journal upon the 22d day of February

Washington's Farewell Address shall be read and that the Presiding Officer shall designate a Senator for that purpose, the Chair designates to read the address upon the 22d of February next the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The signature of the Vice President was announced to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 974. An act for the relief of W. T. Dingler;

H. R. 4184. An act for the relief of C. V. Hinkle;

H. R. 11769. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917; and

H. J. Res. 440. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of War to cease enlisting men in the Regular Army of the United States, except in the case of those men who have already served one or more enlistments therein.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. ROBINSON. I present the credentials of Hon. T. H. CARAWAY, elected to a seat in this body from the State of Arkansas for the term beginning March 4, 1921, and I ask that the same may be read and placed on file.

The credentials were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF ARKANSAS,  
Governor's Office, Little Rock.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November, 1920, T. H. CARAWAY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arkansas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1921.

Witness: His excellency, our governor, Thomas C. McRae, and our seal hereto affixed, at Little Rock, this 15th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1921.

[SEAL.] THOMAS C. McRAE, Governor.

By the governor:

IRA C. HOPPER, Secretary of State.

CARE OF DISABLED EX-SERVICE MEN.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the Legislature of the State of Arkansas adopted a concurrent resolution, the substance of which has been transmitted to me by a telegram from the secretary of state. Some days ago I introduced a bill authorizing the transfer of Fort Logan H. Roots from the War Department to the Public Health Service for use as a hospital for certain disabled soldiers and others. The concurrent resolution indorses the provisions of that bill and urges its enactment.

At the present time there are 19 sick and disabled soldiers confined in the hospital for nervous diseases, which is an institution for the care of the insane in the State of Arkansas. Under the statutes of that State inmates of the hospital may pay not to exceed 50 cents per day for attention and services there. So for the inmates of that hospital who are sick and disabled soldiers the Government can pay only 50 cents a day, while the Federal statute authorizes the payment of \$3 a day. I called the attention of the War Risk Insurance Bureau to the fact that these soldiers are confined in the hospital for the insane at Little Rock, Ark., and I am assured by the Chief of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance that upon receipt of information as to the names and claim numbers of the War Risk inmates they will be transferred to a hospital elsewhere.

The commander of the American Legion for Arkansas, Leigh Kelley, sends me a telegram, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., January 27, 1921.

JOE T. ROBINSON,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Replying to your telegram, I appreciate that as a result of your splendid efforts disabled ex-service men at the State hospital for nervous diseases are to be transferred elsewhere. However, this only takes care of 19, whereas we have thousands of disabled ex-service men in Arkansas for whom adequate hospitalization must be provided. Hope you will make determined effort to obtain Fort Logan H. Roots, as there is no apparent reason for its retention by the military authorities. If permanent transfer can not be effected, it should be transferred temporarily for a period of years to United States Public Health Service. Deplorable lack of hospital facilities for disabled men must ever be a blot on our Government unless immediate steps are taken to provide adequate hospitalization for our Nation's heroes.

LEIGH KELLEY,  
Department Commander American Legion of Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service has twice requested the use of Fort Logan H. Roots for hospital purposes in connection with sick and disabled soldiers, but the War Department has declined the request on the